THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXII.—OCTOBER, 1897.—No. 88.

WHAT DO WE READ?

"Variæ profecto atque innumerabiles sunt inimicorum calliditates artesque nocendi: sed cum primis est plena periculorum intemperantia scribendi, disseminandique in vulgus quæ prave scripta sunt. Nihil enim cogitari potest perniciosius ad inquinandos animos per contemptum religionis perque illecebras multas peccandi."—*Const. Apost. de prohib. et cens. libr.*, viii. Kal. Febr., 1897.

THE new Apostolical Constitution on the prohibition and censure of books has met a want long felt by Catholics at large, and particularly by those who are charged with the direction of consciences. It was evident to them that some of the laws bearing upon this subject were no longer applicable, but it was equally evident that the danger of indiscriminate reading was never so great as it is in our age, in which, as the Holy Father reminds us, "almost every doctrine entrusted by our Saviour to the keeping of His Church, for the salvation of souls, is questioned and attacked." Thence arose in the minds of many a feeling of uncertainty and perplexity, which has now been removed by the authoritative declaration of the Church. She is the divinely constituted guardian of faith and morality, and in that capacity she has the right and the duty to censure and prohibit such writings as endanger either the one or the other, and to remove the censure and prohibition when the danger has ceased to exist.

This principle, unhesitatingly admitted by all Catholics, underlies the General Decrees, published together with the new Apostolical Constitution. All those Decrees, as will appear at a glance, fall quite naturally under the two heads of faith and morality. Those relating to morality, in so far as morality, in its restricted sense, is synonymous with chastity or modesty and is directly opposed to lasciviousness or indecency, do not concern us at present. They do not perceptibly modify previously existing laws, nor do they particularly affect English-speaking Catholics; but

the Decrees bearing directly on faith, and therefore indirectly also on morality in its broader sense of conformity to the whole law of God, have a special relevancy. They are chiefly the following:

1. All books condemned before the year 1600, either by the Sovereign Pontiffs or Œcumenical Councils, and not mentioned in the new Index [to be published hereafter], are to be considered as condemned in the same manner as formerly, excepting such as are permitted by these General Decrees.

2. Books of apostates, heretics, schismatics and all writers whatsoever which champion the cause of error, or which in any way undermine the foundations of religion, are absolutely forbidden.

3. Books of non-Catholics, treating *ex professo* of religion, are likewise forbidden, unless it is certain that they contain nothing contrary to Catholic faith.

4. Books of the aforesaid authors which do not treat *ex professo* of religion, but touch only, in passing, upon truths of faith, are not to be considered as forbidden by ecclesiastical law until they are condemned by a special decree.

The first three General Decrees just quoted call for no comment, but the fourth needs a word of explanation. It is to be remarked, in the first place, that formerly all books written by "heretics," even though they did not treat *ex professo* of religion, were prohibited "until examined and approved." This law, which was considered by theologians as already tacitly abrogated, is now explicitly repealed; and happily so, because, without some relaxation in this matter, English-speaking Catholics would be in a state of perpetual anxiety. For not only are most of the books at their disposal written by non-Catholics, but they frequently treat, in passing, of religion and the truths of faith. Even the atheistic scientist cannot wholly prescind from religion or avoid all allusion to it. The reason is obvious. We meet God everywhere in His creation; to meet Him is to be put in relation with Him, and to express our relation to Him in words is to treat of religion.

It is to be further remarked that the Decree under consideration refers to a prohibition by the positive law of the Church, and not to a prohibition by the natural law; for it is expressly stated that the books in question "are not to be considered as forbidden by *ecclesiastical* law until they are condemned by a special decree." Now, it is plain that, previous to any special decree of the ecclesiastical tribunal, some books which treat only incidentally of religion may be forbidden by the natural law, because they may be an occasion of grave danger to souls. However well-intentioned non-Catholic writers may be, they are liable, when treating of religion, to fall into many serious errors against Catholic faith and morality; and errors incidentally, and perhaps inadvertently, introduced are often the most pernicious.

If in the very title of a work the writer's bigotry betrays itself, if definite charges are preferred which can be traced to their source, if Catholic tenets are openly assailed or Catholic practices

grossly travestied, the sincere Catholic is instantly upon his guard. Disgusted by the absurdity of the allegations or the coarseness of the language, he will fling the book aside; or if with due permission he has the courage to wade through it, he will find little difficulty in clearing the Church from the vulgar imputations which are cast upon her. But if a tone of friendliness is affected, if hackneyed calumnies are carefully discarded, if insinuations and innuendoes are substituted for direct attack, if, under the garb of literature or science, plausible misrepresentations of Catholic doctrines are stealthily introduced, the ordinary reader is thrown off his guard. Fascinated by the novel way in which the subject is presented, he loses sight of its religious aspect. He is not shocked by the grossest blasphemies because they are clothed in decorous language; he accepts the merest sophisms as arguments because they appeal to his vanity; and, before he is fully aware of it, he is half won over. Soon he surrenders himself completely to the spell. He is like one hypnotized by another; he sees with the eyes of another, he hears with the ears of another, he thinks with the thoughts of another. Now, in this respect English-speaking Catholics are at a great disadvantage, which must not be lost sight of.[1]

They are constantly exposed to a thousand subtle and perilous influences which must be counteracted and, if possible, neutralized by a judicious application of the principles either explicitly enunciated or at least implicitly contained in the New Apostolical Constitution. It will be useful for us, therefore, to make an accurate study of the situation in which we find ourselves and of the duties which it imposes upon us.

I.

Some have called the English language a Protestant language. Others have considered this assertion so absurd that they have thought it sufficiently refuted by saying that it is just as reasonable to talk of Protestant arithmetic or of Protestant penmanship as to talk of a Protestant language; and, sooth to say, the assertion does seem a little harsh. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which it is perfectly correct.

"Certain masters of composition," writes Cardinal Newman, "as Shakespeare, Milton and Pope, the writers of the Protestant Bible and Prayer-Book, Hooker and Addison, Swift, Hume and Goldsmith, have been the making of the English language. . . . Men of great ability have taken it in hand, each in his own day, and have done for it what the master of a gymnasium does for the bodily frame. They have formed its limbs and developed its

[1] *Dublin Review*, 1840, "Prejudices, etc."

strength; they have endowed it with vigor, exercised it in suppleness and dexterity and taught it graces."[1] Most of these have been Protestants, and they have impressed upon the language a distinctively Protestant character, just as the great pagan masters of Latin composition impressed upon the language of ancient Rome a distinctively pagan character.

The Protestant character of the language shows itself both negatively and positively. Negatively it shows itself in the absence of appropriate words to express, with precision, the ideas that we mean to convey, when writing on Catholic subjects. A language, like a people, is not Christianized or Catholicized at once. Only after a long and gradual absorption and assimilation of Catholic thought is it fully adapted and consecrated to the service of God and of the Church. How slow and tedious this process is will be readily understood by any one who reflects how many centuries it took before Latin became, in the hands of the Fathers and theologians of the Church, the vehicle that it now is of Catholic doctrine and devotion. The same thing may be said of English; our philosophical and ascetical writers have only just begun to build up a terminology which is both English and Catholic. Positively the Protestant character of the language shows itself in the presence of words designedly offensive to Catholic feeling. Words often have a meaning not warranted by their derivation or composition, but due solely to the use that has been arbitrarily made of them. An obvious example is furnished by certain nicknames which, apart from the association of ideas, seem harmless enough. Those whose memory goes back to the days of "Know-Nothingism" or "Native-Americanism" may recall the irritation of a German or Irish boy when his companions dubbed him "Dutchy" or "Micky." Unless he was of a very pacific disposition, he thought a youthful duel quite in order. He was stung to the quick, not so much because the epithet was meant to express the deliberate contempt entertained for him by the speaker, as because it was supposed to be proof sufficient that he was a foreigner, who deserved to be outlawed on the free soil of America. Somewhat in the same manner, there are numerous words in our vocabulary, such as "Romanist" and "Papist," which not merely imply bigotry and contempt, but which appeal so strongly to inherited prejudice that they pass as arguments admitting of no reply.

What is true of language is still truer of literature, as distinguished from mere language. Literature is the thought of past ages preserved in print. It is not a few random words, cast upon

---

[1] *Idea of a University*, "English Catholic Literature, 3."

the air and lost in empty space, but a force stored away in the library, as the electric spark is stored away in the battery, ready to burst forth and do its work when it finds materials properly disposed. Rousseau's mad paradoxes, preserved in print, kindle revolutions in the boulevards of Paris; Proudhon's communistic maxims raise a storm in the haymarket of Chicago. True, they have been refuted a thousand times over. But all to no purpose. Let some demagogue repeat them to the hungry mob, and depend upon it that they will produce their necessary effect. Such as is the thought of a people, preserved in its literature, such, as a rule, will be its social, moral and religious condition. It is like an element in solution which you can neutralize, but which you cannot destroy.

Now, English thought, as expressed in literature, has been, and still is, mainly Protestant. "We [Catholics] are but a portion of the vast English-speaking, world-wide race," again writes Cardinal Newman, "and are but striving to create a current in the direction of Catholic truth, when the waters are rapidly flowing the other way. In no case can we, strictly speaking, form an English literature; for by the literature of a nation is meant its classics, and its classics have been given to England, and have been recognized as such long since. . . . . We must take things as they are, if we take them at all. . . . . We Catholics, without consciousness and without offence, are ever repeating the half sentences of dissolute playwriters and heretical partizans and preachers. So tyrannous is the literature of a nation; it is too much for us."[1]

An ancient general is said to have conquered and almost annihilated a nation by poisoning the wells and water-courses of the country; so that, while the men fell upon the battle-field, the women and children wasted away with disease in their homes. In civilized warfare such a practice has long since been abandoned. But in English literature it has been systematically pursued up to a recent date. From the very beginning of the so-called Reformation, the English press and pulpit became the ready tools of royalty, and overflowed with falsehood, calumny and ridicule of everything that was most sacred to Catholics. They represented belief in the papal supremacy as treason to the country, construed recusancy into idolatry, and spiced their denunciations with blasphemous attacks upon the doctrine of transubstantiation, the "worship" of the saints, the "adoration" of relics and images, the sale of indulgences carried on by the "Popish" priests, and the license to commit sin granted by the "Romish" Church. Meanwhile Catholic works were excluded from the English realm by

[1] *Id. ibid.*, I, 3.

royal order. An especial license of the pseudo-Archbishop of Canterbury was necessary, in order to import any "Popish book or pamphlet published beyond the seas"; and such license was granted "upon this condition only, that any of them be not dispersed or showed abroad, but first brought to him [the intruded archbishop] or to some of . . . . [the] privy council, that so they may be delivered, or directed to be delivered, forth unto such persons only as by them or some of them shall be thought most meet persons, upon good considerations and purposes, to have the reading of them."[1]

In this manner English literature, during the period of its formation and development, was placed under exclusively Protestant influence. The "well of English undefiled" was poisoned, and its waters have come down to us impregnated with Protestant thought, Protestant views and Protestant principles of action. History, works of general information and education, philosophy and physical science, light literature and the newspaper, have all been enlisted in the service of error, and made to do battle against the Church.

II.

History, according to Cicero, is the "torch of truth"; but during the last three centuries, so far from answering to this definition, it has been, in the words of De Maistre, "a conspiracy against truth." Until recent years this was the case especially with English history. "It would seem," wrote an able critic in 1840, "as if the writers of England had acted under a sort of necessity of fate; as if their pen, like Anacreon's lyre, had a will of its own, independent and uncontrolled by the writer, and [had given] forth its voice but to a single theme, turned by a hidden instinct to the one subject, and made all others subject to it alone."[2] History written from a Protestant standpoint—and scarcely any other was accessible to the English reader—was not merely fiction, but a tissue of lies manufactured out of whole cloth. Conjecture was offered instead of recognized authorities; coarse and scurrilous declamation was substituted for solid proofs; isolated facts, misconceived or misinterpreted, were made the basis of the crudest speculation.

Not only bigoted partisans, like Hume and Gibbon, but authors who are generally considered reliable, did not scruple, when treating of Catholic subjects, to pervert and distort facts, to garble and invent with more than poetic license. Thus, Hallam, whom the English "Quarterly Review" once denounced as "blindly partial to the Catholic party," writes, in his "Constitutional History":

---

[1] Strype's *Life of Archbishop Whitgift.*

[2] *Dublin Review*, as above.

"The saints, but more especially the Virgin, are almost exclusively popular deities of that religion (*i.e.*, the Catholic). All that *Polytheism* was swept away by the Reformers."[1] Even Blackstone, in his "Commentaries on Law," by way of a little historical digression, entertained his readers with the "importation from Rome of the whole farrago of superstitious novelties engendered by the blindness and corruption of the monks—transubstantiation, communion in one kind, the worship of the saints and images." . . . "Newfangled theories," he solemnly added, "were invented, and indulgences were sold to the wealthy *for liberty to sin without danger* . . . . penance was enjoined . . . . and that penance was commuted for money . . . . men were taught to believe that *founding a monastery a little before death would atone for a life of incontinence, disorder and bloodshed.*"[2]

Examples of this kind, which might be indefinitely multiplied, show what extravagant fables were related and accepted as historical truth. They are a sad commentary on the prejudice of the writers and on the credulity of the readers. At the same time they are very instructive, because they explain the mental attitude of the English-speaking public towards the Catholic Church. Fortunately, a feeling of honesty and fairness is beginning to prevail over narrow bigotry and partisan spirit. Since the state archives have been thrown open and state papers have become public property, history is being rewritten, and the unjust verdict of the past is being reversed. German Protestant historians like Hurter, whose researches led him into the bosom of the Catholic Church. Voigt, and others, gave the death-blow to romancing in history, A German Protestant historian has vindicated the Church in the Galileo question, and an English clergyman of the Established Church has painted the characters of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth in darker colors than Catholic writers had ventured to do. But even before their day our own Catholic Lingard had led the way and partly disarmed prejudice by his publication of original documents. Within the last few years the learned Catholic historian, Janssen, and his continuator, Dr. Pastor, have shaken Protestantism, and especially Lutheranism, to its foundations in its very stronghold, by bringing to light the hidden things of darkness, hitherto carefully kept from the public gaze. In brief, the new critical school of historians, who are ransacking all the libraries and archives of Europe in search of original manuscripts, comparing texts, weighing authorities and sifting evidence, has already rendered great service to Catholic truth, and the probability is that it will render still greater service in future. Who now would

---

[1] Vol. i., p. 93.

[2] Italics are ours.

picture the Middle Ages as an unbroken night of ignorance and corruption? Who would represent the "Sicilian Vespers" and "St. Bartholomew's Day" as instances of wholesale butchery instigated by the sanguinary policy of Rome? Who would refer to the Inquisition as to a "tribunal of horrors," in which the cruel Church authorities condemned and wantonly tortured innocent men for maintaining their right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience? Who would write a book on the "Alliance of Popery and Heathenism," or on the "Apostasy of the Pope, the Man of Sin and the Child of Perdition"?[1] Who would call the Popes "pageants or monsters that commonly owed their rise or downfall to crime," or represent St. Gregory VII. as the heartless Hildebrand, who made a great emperor go to Canossa and shiver in the cold of winter, for courageously defending his civil independence? Who would describe Henry VIII. as the "bluff and honest Hal," or Queen Elizabeth as the "good Virgin-Queen Bess," or Mary Tudor as "Bloody Mary," or Mary, Queen of Scots, as a "fiend in human flesh"? None but history-mongers, who make up by unblushing effrontery for want of research, and by a flippant style for want of fairness. Nothing but bad faith or gross ignorance can explain the rehearsal of tales which have been blown to the winds and burst like soap-bubbles. Most of the so-called "Controverted Points of History" are no longer controverted by writers who value their reputations as historians. Documentary evidence is so strongly in favor of the Catholic side as to remove all reasonable doubt.

A great change of tone is also noticeable in works of popular information, such as dictionaries, encyclopædias, miscellanies, libraries and school-manuals. It has not been many years since writers of that sort of books, instead of giving us correct definitions of Catholic terms or explanations of Catholic practices, went deliberately out of their way to malign the Church and represent her doctrines as "unchristian," "blasphemous," "corrupt," "absurd" and "monstrous."

Not only D'Israeli's "Curiosities of Literature," which used to serve the half-educated as "a repertory of all sorts of scraps, odds and ends of learning," but also "Chambers' Encyclopædia," formerly kept on almost every bookshelf as a source of general

[1] Subjects like these entered into the current literature of England and America, and were read as so much inspiration by devout Protestants scarcely more than a hundred years ago. Nowadays they are either wholly avoided or presented in less offensive language, and the attack is directed against Christianity in general almost as much as against Catholicity in particular. Thus, Draper, in his *Conflict of Religion and Science*, while aiming his shafts mainly at the Catholic Church, would have us believe (p. 42) that even from the very earliest days there was an amalgamation of Christianity and paganism. Mr. Draper trips frequently upon history as well as upon logic.

information, and even the "British Encyclopædia," called with pride "a national work," indulged in ill-digested tirades against Catholics, and repeated nursery-tales as historical facts. "Transubstantiation" was called "that arch-legerdemain of the Romish priests." "The worship of the true God," we were informed, "was exchanged [by the Romanists] for the worship of bones, bits of wood (said to be of the true cross) and the images of saints." "The genuine religion of Jesus was utterly unknown." [In the opinion of Catholics] "an accumulation of crimes can be dissipated by a few orisons," and the "venal priest, claiming to hold the place of God, can traffic with the divine power at a very moderate price." The Jesuits, we were assured, had *Monita Secreta* (secret instructions) communicated to the leading men, but carefully kept from the public, and even from the common members of the order. The published constitutions, except for the fact that they made the rank and file blind tools of designing leaders, were fair enough; but the *Secret Instructions* were a mystery of cunning and iniquity. Cardinal Bellarmine (a Jesuit, of course) taught that, "if the Pope forbid the exercise of virtue and command that of vice, the Roman Church, under pain of sin, is bound to abandon virtue for vice." "The worship paid to the Virgin Mary in Spain and Italy exceeds that which is given to the Son or the Father"; so says D'Israeli, who goes on describing that worship in terms which a sense of propriety prevents us from quoting.

These are a few extracts from books, at one time regarded as standard works. That such things should have been written when bigotry had shut out the light of reason is not surprising. That some of them should have been reprinted in a recent edition of the "British Encyclopædia" needs no other explanation than that they were supplied by that most unreliable of authorities, the Rev. Mr. Littledale. That they should be believed, in the face of the evidence now accessible to all, argues a degree of credulity not reached even by those good folk who still persist in believing in the existence of "Diana Vaughan" and in her satanic revelations. In striking contrast with the books referred to is the "American Encyclopædia," whose articles upon Catholic subjects are mostly, if not exclusively, from the pens of Catholics.

What has been said of works of popular information may likewise be said of school-manuals and text-books. Time was when it was a part even of secular education to distort and pervert the language of Catholic devotion, and to ridicule the usages and ceremonies of the Church. Here are some specimens, familiar to every scholar. Campbell in his "Rhetoric," still in use as a book

of reference, approvingly selects, as a specimen of the humorous, a coarse extract from "Hudibras" about

> "Crosses, relics, crucifixes,
> Beads, pictures, rosaries and pixes:
> The tools of working out salvation
> By mere mechanic operation."

Whately, in his "Rhetoric," gives as an example of a metaphor, "the *polluted* stream of *Romish* tradition"; and in his "Logic," taught not many years ago in Catholic institutions, he adduces some misconceived or misinterpreted doctrines of the Catholic Church as an exemplification of a *sophism*, and warns the reader against some ridiculous ambiguity, which, he adds, "has greatly favored the Church of *Rome*."

The text-book of geography, formerly in common use in our Catholic schools, after instructing the pupil that the nations which ranked highest in point of culture are called *enlightened*, informed him that among those which had attained to this excellence in the social scale were the "*Protestant* cantons of Switzerland." Why not the Catholic cantons as well? However, discrimination of that sort, though embittering, is harmless as compared with the bigotry which is condensed into some manuals of history specially prepared for the use of the public schools. All the venom contained in a diluted form in the larger volumes of some discredited writers of history is carefully extracted and administered in strong doses to the youth of the land. Surely, it needs no special rule of the "Index" to convince Catholic parents that they cannot in conscience allow their children to read such parodies of Catholic doctrine and Catholic morals as are found in the historical compendiums by Myers and Freeman, and in the "Story of Liberty" by Coffin. The discussions in public print called forth by these books have made it evident to all how many snares are laid for the faith of Catholic children. But they have also made it evident how willing our non-Catholic fellow-citizens are to do us justice, if our grievances are calmly and clearly represented to them. The "Resolutions" lately passed by an overwhelming majority of votes in the Indiana House of Representatives against "a certain book entitled 'The Story of Liberty'" are an eloquent tribute to the fairmindedness of the whole body, no less than to the intrepidity of the Catholic member who introduced them, and to the zeal of the priest who first exposed the fraud practiced upon the community.[1]

---

[1] The Hon. Peter Wallrath and the Rev. A. B. Oechtering, both of Indiana.

III.

The signs of the times are certainly hopeful. Still it is not prudent to trust them too much. While the anti-Catholic bias is, on the whole, weakening and gradually disappearing, it is as strong and unreasonable as ever in the domain of science, both metaphysical and physical. And naturally so. The early Protestant Reformers had an instinctive dread of philosophy. They decried clear statements, accurate distinctions and close reasoning as scholastic subtilities, metaphysical hair-splitting and logic-chopping. Of the English Reformers, in particular, it has been said that if they deigned to employ arguments against Catholics they resorted to it, not for the sake of discovering the truth, but solely, in the spirit of Luther, "for the lust of triumph and to annoy the Pope." The consequence has been fatal to philosophy; indeed, it is scarcely too much to affirm that, outside of the Catholic schools, philosophy has ceased to exist in England. The decline began with Lord Bacon, whom Cardinal Newman calls "the most orthodox of the Protestant philosophers." For, though he undoubtedly rendered great services to the natural sciences by the stress which he laid on observation and experiment, he also did no little harm by his apparent disregard for analytic principles, without which observation and experiment have no scientific value; so that, in a certain sense, the fruit already contained the worm which was some day to consume it. Those who followed the sage of Verulam were sciolists, without the mental discipline required for philosophical speculation; they were empiricists who relied upon their own observations, without sufficient knowledge of metaphysical principles to interpret those observations correctly. They observed the phenomena, now of the material world, now of their own minds, and they ended by becoming materialists who admitted the existence of matter only, idealists who recognized the existence of mind only, or sceptics who doubted the existence of both matter and mind. From Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley and Hume, down to the present, the descent has continued with an ever accelerating speed.

Meanwhile the natural sciences have become the battle-ground of irreligion. Men of undeniable industry and talent for research, but poorly equipped with philosophical principles and often bitterly hostile to the Church, enter the field and strive to occupy every vantage-ground. Many of them make it their aim to show, by a long array of so-called facts, that there is an irreconcilable conflict between science and Christianity; and Christianity with them means Catholicity.[1] Geology, palæontology, biology, an-

[1] Draper: *Conflict of Religion and Science*, Preface, pp. 10, 11.

thropology, ethnology, archæology are all called upon in succession to do battle against the Church. When the facts discovered do not lend themselves readily to the task they are carefully manipulated, or others that have no actual existence are fabricated to suit. It is never admitted that the real facts are susceptible of various and contradictory explanations, and that, therefore, they prove nothing. It is not hinted that, though some new researches have been made, all the difficulties that can be legitimately drawn therefrom against religion were substantially brought forward and answered ages ago. Often it is not even seriously attempted to prove the pretended conclusions of science. The object is to undermine the foundations of religion and to disturb the minds of the faithful; and as solid arguments are wanting, recourse is had to sophistry. Such is the temper in which Dr. Draper, of New York, and Dr. Andrew White, late President of Cornell University, wrote the one his "History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science," the other "A History of the Warfare of Science and Theology in Christendom."[1]

Natural science, having become largely materialistic, has, in its turn, reacted on philosophy, until the true notion of philosophy has been lost. Physics are confounded with metaphysics, physiology with psychology, matter with spirit, manners with morals. Cut loose from the ancient moorings, men have drifted about upon a sea of doubt until they have landed in hopeless agnosticism and pessimism—the philosophy of nescience and the ethics of despair. This is the sort of thing which is palmed off on the world as the wisdom of the nineteenth century, which is purchased as such by the great libraries and taught as such in the universities of the country. There is now before us the *prospectus* of a "School of Philosophy" attached to a well-known university.[2] The school has a rich endowment and a long list of salaried professors. It claims to be "devoted to the free and unhampered quest and propagation of truth." Its courses of instruction embrace "a complete, if tentative, system of psychology, based on the results of the experimental investigation of consciousness"—"a drill-course on the psychology of sensation"—"a drill-course on the psycho-physics of action"—"lectures on psycho-physical measurement-methods"—"a rapid survey of philosophy during Greek, Roman and mediæval periods, the greater part of the year [being] devoted to the theories and problems of modern speculation . . . and especially to an examination of the philosophical meaning and

[1] Such books seem to us to fall under the second rule of the General Decrees cited above, and therefore to be absolutely forbidden to all who have not obtained leave from the proper authority.

[2] "Sage School of Philosophy," Cornell University.

importance of the notion of Evolution and Development"—"lectures on the Development of Moral Ideas among mankind in primitive, ancient and modern times . . . primitive Religion, the origin of religious ideas, cults, rites, etc." Among the authors to be read or studied are the chief materialistic psychologists of modern times, besides Locke, Hume, Berkeley, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Schopenhauer, etc. Some slight notice is taken of Aristotle and Plato, but not a word about the great Catholic thinkers and master-minds—not one of them is so much as mentioned by name. The *prospectus* closes with an advertisement offering to supply the universities and schools of the country with professors and teachers, who are apparently being manufactured in large numbers and at short notice. "*Sapienti sat.*"

In our high-schools the case stands even worse. The philosophy taught in them is commonly nothing but a history of false systems, with all the vagaries and aberrations of the human mind, to some of which the learned professor gives his adhesion. Said a bright lad, presumably a Catholic, to a professor who had been expounding Spinoza: "I understand you to hold, professor, that you are a part of the divinity." "Correct." "And that I am a part of the divinity." "Correct." "But you also told us that we must worship the divinity; must I worship you, sir?" The professor felt decidedly uncomfortable; the pupil left the school-room, never to reappear in it. There was in the same school at least one other Catholic pupil, a girl, who laid her case before the writer of this article. She was preparing for a teacher's certificate. If she did not follow that course of pantheistic philosophy, she had only one alternative: to take anatomy instead, which was seemingly regarded as a cognate science, not very dissimilar from experimental psychology, which is looked upon as advanced philosophy; but her maidenly modesty shrank from that study. How mighty is modern science! It can replace, or displace, almost anything! True, it has been pronounced "bankrupt" by a very competent authority, and some of its latest conclusions are manifestly an insult to common sense; yet, for all that, we may take it for granted that its terminology will be perpetuated, to the great detriment of true science and the embarrassment of real scholars. The "*survival of the fittest*, *struggle for life*, *natural selection*, *anthropoid ape*," and other terms equally *scientific*, will continue to figure in science-primers, and will be explained as expressive of the highest modern wisdom to the callow youth of our public schools; and at the same time there will be sown in their minds the seeds of materialism and agnosticism, together with a hatred of the Catholic Church, the inveterate enemy of science and progress (!).

IV.

But if philosophy is banished from the schools, it seems to have found a refuge with tourists and travellers, with novelists and journalists—in brief, with the writers of light literature. Without having a university degree, they all wear the doctor's cap and philosophize, after their own fashion, about the Catholic Church. They interpret her doctrines and her ceremonies, and portray the baneful effects of her devotions upon the multitude or upon the heroes and heroines of their stories in so lively a manner that the incautious reader is in danger of accepting as facts what are merely the hallucinations of a morbid imagination. Here is an amusing instance in point: A writer who makes great pretensions to scholarship visits Spain, and, as a matter of course, publishes his valuable experience among the benighted "Romanists" of that country. Very soberly he assures us that they not merely practically make the Virgin Mary the "equal of God," but that they actually call her so in their prayers. He had heard them invoke her as "Deipara." He remembered enough of Latin to know that "Dei" means "of God," and that "par," to which our English word "pair" is related, means "equal;" therefore he concluded that "Deipara" means the "equal of God." But he did not know or remember that "para" is derived from a Latin root, signifying the same thing as our English word "parent," and that "Deipara" means not the "equal," but the "parent or mother of God." The enterprising tourist might hear us invoking the Blessed Virgin daily by the same title.

The daughter of an Anglican minister, well known by her writings, composes a novel in which there occur several Catholic characters. They are well drawn and have many amiable qualities; but unfortunately, like all Catholics, following the teachings of their Church, they are constantly doing wrong that good may come of it. They can't help it, you see; it is the effect of Catholic training.

But why multiply examples? Protestant fiction, no matter under what name it disguises itself, from the "revelations of converted priests" or of "escaped nuns," for "men" or "women" only, down to the goody-goody narratives in children's story-books, is the stronghold of anti-Catholic traditions. According to these *veracious* accounts, "Romanists" are either wilful idolaters and worshipers of "graven images," who lead licentious lives and purchase the forgiveness of their crimes from the priest, or else they are innocent dupes who have never yet seen a Bible, and who become Protestants as soon as they begin to read the "holy book." Nuns are either "witches" who "kidnap" or "decoy" young maidens from the fair world into the gloomy cloister, or they are

deluded victims, detained against their will, imprisoned, immured, and praying for some vigilance-committee to come and set them free. Priests are rude and imperious task-masters who extort money from their flocks, or they are sleek and unscrupulous courtiers who wear the clerical gown in order to pose before the world and win its applause. The members of the religious orders are "coarse, uncouth and unwashed monks," too ignorant to administer the sacraments validly; or they are "sly and designing Jesuits," who approach you with a "soft, velvety, cat-like step," then suddenly pounce upon you and hold you tightly in their clutches. With the advance of civilization this latter type is naturally becoming more common. Indeed, according to the Protestant notion, "Jesuits" are ubiquitous and omnigenous. They are not merely the members of the religious order, known as the Society of Jesus; they are all the special agents of Rome, public and private, and these are legion. There are clerical Jesuits and lay Jesuits; there are male Jesuits and female Jesuits; there are avowed Jesuits among the "Romish" priesthood and crypto-Jesuits among the Protestant clergy; there are Jesuits in the United States' Senate and in the English House of Lords, as there are Jesuits in the sculleries and nurseries of devout Protestant families, whose children they seek to pervert. "They are rapidly winding their net around the liberties of the nation."[1]

Here we have struck the key-note of Protestant fiction, and that suffices to determine its character. We need no more. But what of periodical literature, which has assumed such proportions in our days that it usurps the name of the *press?* "Great is journalism," exclaims Carlyle. "Is not every editor a ruler of the world, being a persuader of it?" There is no denying the fact that the *press* has grown to be a mighty factor in human affairs. It creates public opinion, controls politics, dictates laws, makes and unmakes governments. It invades the privacy of domestic life, and even the sanctuary of religion; it presumes to prescribe, not only what men are to eat and drink, but what they are to believe.

Now, it is a subject of complaint the world over that in many lands the secular *press* is in the hands of the bitterest enemies of religion, and that, as a rule, its spirit is decidedly anti-Catholic. Many ponderous quarterlies and monthlies teem with long and malicious articles, whose object is to undermine the foundations of religion. Many weekly and daily newspapers treat the reading

[1] We quote these words, after Mr. James Britten, from a book commented upon by him in one of his interesting articles on "Protestant Fiction," published as a serial in *The Month*, beginning November, 1895. The extracts which he has made are as amusing as a "Joke-Book."

public to a periodical instalment of crime, sensation and scandal; they insult the feelings of all right-minded men by low and vile caricatures of religious persons and practices, and by the altogether unchristian tone in which they write about all things whatsoever; and, in particular, they disturb the consciences of Catholics by false reports and forged despatches about the Holy See and Church legislation generally, and by articles manifestly intended to foster religious animosity and discord. Yet, on the whole, the secular *press* in this country is, perhaps, quite as respectful to the Church as it is to the Protestant sects; or if it does her the honor of making her the object of special attacks, the reason is it that looks upon her as the only genuine representative of Christianity.

V.

In general, we are justified in saying that the tone of English literature is far less hostile towards the Church than it used to be. To be sure, Protestant Tract Societies go on reprinting the old stories about the Pope being anti-Christ and the Catholic Church being the "scarlet woman" and the "beast" of the Apocalypse, for the special edification of hymn-singing spinsters and Sunday-school teachers. Protestant religious papers still bristle with anti-popery articles, and Evangelical Alliances draw up and distribute "Resolutions" for the suppression of "Romanism." But ordinarily such things have the same effect on the intelligent public as Burchard's cry of "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion"; the poison contains its own antidote.

As a rule, the attitude of non-Catholic writers towards the Church is not positively aggressive. Like Frederick Harrison, when pushed to the wall by Mr. Wilfred Ward, they affect to ignore the Church altogether as an antiquated system, beneath the notice of our progressive age; or, like Charles Dickens, they make it a point "never [to] publish anything, fact or fiction, which [gives] a favorable view of any one under the influence of the Catholic faith . . . . anything which [can] possibly dispose any mind whatever in favor of Romanism, even by the example of a real good man."[1] Such tactics, adopted by well-known writers, are an indication of the general trend of popular literature; or, to use a homely expression, they are "straws which show what way the wind blows." When the non-Catholic secular literature of the day does not openly advocate infidelity, when it does not try to enlist our sympathy and our love for what is condemned by the laws of the Church and of right reason, it at least inculcates indifferentism and naturalism. Running through it all there is a vein

[1] Miss Martineau's Autobiogr., American edition, vol. ii., page 93.

of anti-Catholic thought and, consequently, of anti-Catholic principles of morality. Nor is the so-called Catholic popular literature quite free from the infection. Many nominally Catholic newspapers, as the learned Dr. Brownson remarked in his day, unknowingly uphold Jacobinical or Protestant principles. The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore are no less emphatic when they warn us that not all newspapers which profess to be Catholic really deserve that name, because, though the editors boast of being Catholics, they discredit the Church by their example and their writings, and expose her to ridicule; because they uphold and spread heretical and infidel views, calculated to undermine the authority of the Church and of the State.[1] Many nominally Catholic novels hold up to our admiration characters whose excellence is made to consist in what the laws of the Church and right reason must alike condemn as immoral and vicious.[2]

Literature of this kind, if not worse, is the ordinary mental pabulum of the so-called reading public, and is devoured, especially by the young, with a morbid appetite, which is one of the worst symptoms of our age. Carlyle did not put the case too strongly when he wrote: "Not the wretchedest circulating-library novel which foolish girls thumb and con in remote villages but will help to regulate the actual practical weddings and households of those foolish girls. So 'Celia' felt, so 'Clifford' acted; the foolish Theorem of Life stamped into those young brains comes out a solid Practice one day." The newspaper and the novel are the sources from which many persons draw almost all their information and the rules for their guidance through life. As these abound in error, it is not surprising that even such as are at heart very earnest Catholics often unknowingly hold views at variance with their religion. The poison is so dexterously mixed with the food that the ordinary reader fails to distinguish it. He takes it into his system in infinitesimal doses, and, like the opium-eater, gradually grows so accustomed to it that he is not aware of the effect which it has upon him. It affects his whole mental constitution, shapes his thoughts and his conduct, and forms, or rather deforms, his character. Like the man in the French comedy who had spoken prose for thirty years without knowing it, many Catholics are constantly speaking a Protestant language and defending Protestant principles without in the least suspecting it. Their error is blameless, but it is not harmless. For, as Dr. Brownson

[1] Tit. VII., *De Libr. et Ephem.*, p. 126, n. 228.

[2] Dr. Brownson finds this fault even with Lady Fullerton's *Grantley Manor*, which many readers probably regard as a model Catholic novel. Marion Crawford, likewise, is severely and, we think, deservedly censured by several Catholic writers.

observes, "no [such] error is harmless . . .; every error is, at bottom, an error against the faith or the truth taught by the Church. . . . Errors . . . which do not kill the faith outright may yet impair its soundness, render it weak and sickly, and hinder the free, healthy and vigorous growth of Catholic piety. Even these indirect and remote errors against faith, which may coexist in the mind with a firm faith in the Christian mysteries, conceal the germs of heresy, which some acute, bold and self-willed reasoner may one day develop and mature into a doctrine formally heretical, and which may prove the destruction of thousands, perhaps millions, of souls. All heresies take their rise in popular literature or science. No heresiarch sets out with the express and formal denial of the faith; for no man, in the outset, intends to be a heresiarch—ever says to himself, 'Go to, now; let us found a heresy.' His heresy is only the logical development of principles which he finds already incorporated into popular literature and science, already received as axioms by the popular mind, and held by persons of unquestioned orthodoxy. . . . The danger becomes especially great in a Protestant country where we breathe constantly the atmosphere of heresy, and form our literary and scientific tastes and habits by the study of heretical writings."[1]

To put it briefly: The evil adherent even in our least objectionable secular literature is not simply the absence of distinctively Catholic thought, but the presence of anti-Catholic or Protestant thought in a diluted form. The ordinary reader imagines it to be harmless because it seems neutral and colorless; but just as the spectroscope manifests, in the white light of the stars, the presence of a variety of elements not detected by the naked eye, even so a careful analysis manifests, in the current literature of the day, the presence of many erroneous principles. The evil cannot be altogether prevented, because, as Cardinal Newman remarks, we cannot create a strictly Catholic English literature. If we read English literature at all, we cannot avoid reading much that is more or less at variance with Catholic truth and Catholic thought.

What, then, are we to do? Shall we confine ourselves to translations from the French, Italian and German? If we do, we shall fare no better, perhaps worse. Shall we abstain from reading anything except a few pious ascetical works? No, certainly not. In our days and in our country men and women, boys and girls will read, must read, unless they wish to be considered behind the age. For Catholics it is not a matter of choice, but of duty towards themselves and their religion, not to be outdone by their Protestant or infidel countrymen in acquiring the information befitting

[1] *Brownson's Review*, 1848. Not having by us the doctor's works, we cannot give more exact reference for this extract, made years ago.

their position in society. What, then, are we to do? This is the practical question which we propose to answer briefly before concluding, and if we succeed in doing so satisfactorily, we shall consider that we have done some substantial good. We say, therefore, in the first place, that we should cultivate Catholic instincts and Catholic habits of thought, which will enable us to discern almost spontaneously what is conformable or opposed to the spirit of the Church, to the dogmas of Catholic faith and the laws of Catholic morality. We say, in the second place, that from the mass of non-Catholic publications we should select the least objectionable, and read even these with much caution and discernment.

And what is meant by Catholic instincts? The eagle is said to tend instinctively towards the light of the sun. Just so the mind trained to Catholic habits of thought tends, by a sort of intuition, towards the light of faith. "So alert," writes Cardinal Newman, "is the instinctive power of an educated conscience that by some secret faculty, and without any intelligible reasoning process, it seems to detect moral truth wherever it lies hid, and feels a conviction of its own accuracy which bystanders cannot account for; and this especially in the case of revealed religion, which is one comprehensive moral fact—according to the saying, 'I know my sheep and am known by them.'" Catholic instincts are the result of a thoroughly practical Catholic life, and they are often found in the simple faithful quite as much as in the highly educated; for the mind discerns, without any labored process of reasoning, what is in harmony with its general habits of thought, and the heart is naturally drawn towards what is in sympathy with its virtuous inclinations.

But if our Catholic instincts are to be of any real service to us in detecting and avoiding concealed dangers to faith and morality, we must be able to give a rational account of the faith that is within us. For this purpose it is not sufficient to have attended the parish-school in childhood, to have learned our Catechism, to have said our prayers morning and night, to have heard Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation, and to have frequented the sacraments, if between times we read nothing but the cheap literature which weighs down the shelves of public libraries and school libraries, and if, in maturer years, we confine ourselves to the daily paper, with its stock of scandal, irreligion and falsehood, and to the thousand and one works of fiction offered for a song by cheap book-stores and news-venders at the street-corners. The Fathers of the last Plenary Council of Baltimore, fully alive to the wants of the times, insist strongly upon this point. In their *Pastoral Letter* they appeal to Catholic parents in the following language:

"Remember, Christian parents, that the development of the youthful character is intimately connected with the development of the taste for reading. Of books, as well as of associations, may be held the wise saying: 'Show me your company, and I will tell you what you are.' See, then, that none but good books and newspapers, as well as none but good companions, be admitted to your homes. Train your children to a love of history and biography; inspire them with the ambition to become so well acquainted with the history and doctrines of the Church as to be able to give an intelligent answer to every honest inquirer. Should their surroundings call for it, encourage them, as they grow older, to acquire such knowledge of popularly mooted questions of a scientific or philosophical character as will suffice to make them firm in their faith and proof against sophistry."

This earnest recommendation of the American hierarchy is not so difficult to observe as some parents may perhaps imagine; for though we have not and cannot hope to have, strictly speaking, a Catholic English literature, we already have a host of thoroughly Catholic writers who may well challenge comparison. In point of style and literary merit Cardinal Manning and Dr. Brownson have few, if any, superiors among modern English writers, while in point of profound thought and close reasoning Dr. Brownson stands forth among his non-Catholic American contemporaries as "an Apollo among satyrs." Around these two great luminaries there cluster many others, and their number is growing so rapidly that to the unprejudiced mind they seem a galaxy brilliant enough to attract the notice of the least observant. We Catholics sometimes complain, and with reason, that our writers are ignored by the Protestant literary world, or, at least, that they are not assigned the place which they deserve among the literary celebrities of the age. But possibly we ourselves are chiefly to blame for this apparent slight. Too often, it is to be feared, we do not appreciate our writers at their full value; too often, perhaps, we are ignorant of their works and even of their names, while we are fully conversant with the non-Catholic literature of the day. If so, it is not a little to our discredit; for surely, before making the acquaintance of strangers, we ought to be familiar with the members of the household.

Once educated, by the study of Catholic authors, to habits of Catholic thought, and well informed upon the questions at issue between ourselves and our adversaries, we shall run less risk by reading non-Catholic writers, because we shall have the principles by which to test them. Yet even then we should select from the mass of non-Catholic publications such as are least objectionable. "Happily," as the Fathers of the Council of Baltimore remind us,

"the store of Catholic literature, as well as works which, though not written by Catholics nor treating of religion, are pure, instructive and elevating, is now so large that there can be no excuse for running risk or wasting one's time with what is inferior, tainted or suspicious."

Finally, we should not forget that whatever does not bear clearly stamped on its face the seal of Catholic orthodoxy should be read with much discernment. However fair a non-Catholic writer may wish to be, his own habits of thought are apt to betray him into involuntary misrepresentations of Catholic principles. Let us, therefore, apply to everything the touchstone of Catholic truth, and rest assured that whatever cannot stand this test is an error, for truth can never be at variance with truth. Above all, let us never allow the religious doubts that may arise to fix themselves in our minds; and if we do not ourselves find the solution, let us seek it from those who are able to give it. Catholic truth may be temporarily obscured by the clouds of error which pass before it, but it can no more be extinguished than the sun in heaven. "Magna est veritas et prævalebit." R. J. M.

THE STRUGGLE OF POLISH CATHOLICITY WITH RUSSIAN "ORTHODOXY."

JUST as to the sword of France the Europe of the early Middle Age owed its escape from imminent Mussulman domination, so does modern Europe owe to Poland the fact that it is not to-day either Turkish or Muscovite. Few publicists of the nineteenth century, that century of superficialities which is ever prone to ignore all that is truly grand, care to remember this fact; and still fewer ever note that the Holy See—always ready to perpetuate a nation's title to the gratitude of Christendom—conferred on the Polish kingdom, almost from its inception, the designation of "Most Orthodox," just as it had rewarded the zeal of the first French monarch with the style of "Most Christian." From the reign of Boleslas the Great[1] to the crime of 1772, the chivalry of

[1] It was only during the reign of Boleslas (992–1025) that the work of converting the Poles was terminated. Christianity had been brought into Eastern Poland during the latter part of the ninth century by Bulgaro-Greek monks, sent by St. Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, the victim of Photius (see our "Studies in Church History," vol. ii., p. 56). These missionaries introduced the Slavo-Greek rite into Moravia, whence they passed into Chrobatia (Western Gallicia), and shortly afterward their disciples introduced the same liturgy among the Poles along the Dnieper. The Latin rite was propagated among the Poles along the Oder and the Vistula toward the end of the tenth century, having come into Poland with the Czeck (Bohemian) princess, Dombrowska, when she espoused the duke, Mieczyslas I., the first Christian prince of the country. For many years the religion of the Poles was a mixture of Christianity and idolatry; but Boleslas witnessed the disappearance of the last remnant of paganism. Boleslas was one of the greatest princes of the Middle Age, whether he be regarded as warrior, legislator, or administrator; in fact, he was the Polish Charlemagne. He guaranteed his people against the onslaughts of their Russian, Bohemian, and German neighbors by subduing Chrobatia, Silesia, and Pomerania, and incorporating them into the new kingdom of Poland, which came into existence in the year 1000, when the emperor Otho III. crowned Boleslas at Gniesen, expressly avowing that Poland should never owe any vassalage to the Germanic empire. A few years only passed, and Boleslas had extended his dominions from the Dnieper to the Elbe. Boleslas was not satisfied with his coronation at the hands of Otho III., even though that monarch was the Holy Roman Emperor; he again and again despatched embassies to Rome, soliciting royal consecration from the Head of the Church. But as all these messengers were captured by the Germans, with whom after the death of Otho III. the Poles were continually at war, Boleslas received the royal unction from his own bishops toward the end of his life. Boleslas II., the third successor of the great Boleslas, lost the royal dignity because of his crimes. With his own hand he murdered at the altar the holy bishop of Cracow, Stanislaus, who had reproved him for his immoralities. Excommunicated and deposed by Pope St. Gregory VII., he died miserably in Hungary, and as the Pontiff had reduced Poland to the rank of a duchy, in order to teach other monarchs a lesson, there were no more kings of Poland during the next two hundred and forty years. Then Pope John XXII. yielded to the prayers of the nation and allowed the duke, Ladislas Loketek, to don the royal crown.

Poland repelled ninety-one Tartar invasions, any one of which, if successful, would have at least jeopardized the existence of European civilization. For many centuries that chivalry was the sole barrier of Europe against the triumph of Muscovite ambition; and the reason of the Polish success is to be found, not in the unquestionable valor of the Polish heart, not in any solidity of the government which directed that valor, but in the religious tie which bound the Poles together—the only tie which this restive people have ever regarded as unbreakable. This is the most salient fact in all Polish history. The political constitution of Poland was the most faulty in Christendom, probably in the world; and precisely because of that constitution, her history is that of an almost continual civil war—a condition of things which in any other land would have rendered foreign invasion synonymous with national ruin. But so long as the religious tie remained, Poland could have a hundred thousand masters in the persons of her fractious nobles; the entire *people* could be serfs; and there would be but one law and one country for every Polander. For many centuries the battle-hymn of this warlike race was a beautiful canticle in honor of Our Lady, which had been composed by the martyr St. Adalbert, the first apostle of Northern Poland; and to mention only one of the many customs which show how the Catholic spirit was identified with Polish patriotism, what a lesson the Polish boy received when, while assisting at Mass, he noticed that at the reading of the Gospel every noble drew his sword half-way out of the scabbard, in sign of his sworn devotion to the faith, even unto death. The enemies of Poland, both Prussian and Muscovite, fully realized that in that devoted land the names of Catholicism and country invoke each other; that, as the idea has been well expressed by Poland's latest panegyrist, "from St. Adalbert to Mgr. Felinski, these words have one and the same sound. Not one step can be taken against the national liberty without treading on the corpse of a bishop; and never is religious liberty demanded, without a simultaneous effort for the national independence. Only this close connection between the principles of the faith and Polish nationality can explain the otherwise inexplicable resistance of Poland to all the political combinations, and to all the onslaughts, which to this day have tended to reduce her to the condition of a simple province of the Russian empire. The political hostility is nothing when compared to the violent antipathy which the difference of religion induces in the two peoples—an antipathy which renders a fusion impossible, unless at the price of a veritable metamorphosis of conscience, that is, of a sincere conversion of Russia herself. For we must remember that if the national spirit of Poland, such as ten centuries of history have

made it, is absolutely antipathetic to any assimilation with Russia, just so the national spirit of Russia, such as schism has made it, is no less incompatible with Polish civilization. This fact politicians refuse obstinately to acknowledge; and, therefore, no progress is made in the ways of a diplomacy which is indifferent to the demands of a people's conscience, and which is blinded by rationalistic impiety."[1] In fact, the crime of 1772 had scarcely been consummated, when Catharine II. realized that there can be no medium between an absolute dependence of the Church on the State and an absolute distinction of the two powers;[2] that if

[1] Lescoeur, *The Catholic Church in Poland under the Russian Government*, vol. i., p. 14, Paris, 1876.

[2] Originally the Muscovite schismatic bishops enjoyed a quasi-independence, since they depended from the distant patriarch of Constantinople. But when the patriarch, Jeremiah II., sold the patriarchal dignity to the Metropolitan of Moscow in 1588, the Russian prelates became mere instruments of the czar. It was not the simoniacal Jeremiah who gave the investiture to the new patriarch, but the grand-duke of Muscovy himself in these words: "Most worthy patriarch, father of all the fathers, first of all the bishops of Russia, I give thee precedence over all the bishops; I give thee the right to wear the patriarchal mantle, the cap of a bishop, and the great mitre; and I order that thou be recognized and honored as a patriarch, and the brother of all the patriarchs" (Theiner, *Vicissitudes of the Two Rites*, i., 18, Paris, 1843). The principle here implied has been ever recognized by the schismatics of Russia. The author of the *Life of St. Josaphat* cites the following declaration of a Bulgarian archbishop: "The emperor is placed over all the churches. He is, and he is styled, the prince of wisdom; and consequently he presides over synods, and gives force to their decisions; he deposes the ministers of the Church; he prescribes the rule of life for the ministers of the altar; he even sanctions the judgments of the bishops. In fine, in one word, *in everthing except the power to sacrifice, the emperor exercises publicly all the pontifical functions; and he does so legitimately and canonically*" (Guepin, *St. Josephat Kuncewicz, Archbishop of Polock, Martyr for Catholic Unity, and of the United Greek Church in Poland*, vol. i., p. 44, Paris, 1874). The name of this Bulgarian prelate was Demetrius Chomatenus; and his decision is given at length by Lequien, in his *Oriens Christianus*, vol. ii., p. 295. The bloody Ivan IV., surnamed the Terrible, was very fond of exhibiting himself pontifically. "Ivan believed that kings are also pontiffs in their own states, and often he officiated pontifically with exemplary devotion. He used to prepare himself for these pontifical functions by a retreat in the monastery of Alexandrowa" (Ivan Ivanovisch, *Memoir on the Reign of Peter the Great*, vol. i., p. 180. The Hague, 1725). The East was always prone to recognize the right of the emperors to interfere in the things of the sanctuary. In the days of St. Athanasius we find the same forces at work which we now discern in Russia; an emperor grasping the crozier, servile schismatic bishops, and resisting Roman Pontiffs. In 355, at the Council of Milan, the Emperor Constantius, tempting the bishops to condemn St. Athanasius, said: "*My will ought to be a law of the Church for you; such is the power which the bishops of Syria recognize in me. Obey, therefore, or go into exile.*" However, neither Constantius nor any other Arian emperor ever attempted such usurpation as the schismatic, or rather heretical so-called "Orthodox" Church condones in the Russian czar of our day. By the insitution of the Holy Synod, Peter the Great became the sole effective patriarch in his dominions, the real guide of consciences; and this power has been exercised ever since, whether by the prostituted Catharine II., or by the maniac Paul, or by the cruel Nicholas, or by the comparatively decent latest emperors. By its very constitution this Holy Synod is completely dependent on the czar, and its president is ordinarily a soldier. This tribunal is

Poland was to continue subject to Russia, either Poland should become schismatic, or Russia should become Catholic; that, therefore, all the Russian promises concerning religious toleration in Poland should be trampled under foot.

Before we approach the main subject of this article, the persecutions visited on Catholic Poland by "Orthodox" Russia, a few words must be devoted to a point which, when not understood, is apt to induce confusion in the mind of the tyro who starts on an investigation into the ecclesiastical conditions of Eastern Europe. We have observed that a portion of Poland received Christianity from missionaries who, although in communion with Rome (for the schism had not yet been effected), belonged to the Greek rite; that is, who, while in strict subjection to the Roman Pontiff, used the Greek liturgy in the Mass, and followed a discipline which differed from that of Rome in several unessential points, as, for instance, in the matter of the celibacy of the secular clergy. So long as the patriarchate of Constantinople continued in the Roman obedience, there was no friction between the Poles of the Latin and those of the Greco-Slavonic rite, nor was there any immediately after Cerularius withdrew the peoples of his immediate jurisdiction from the unity of the Church (y. 1054), for it is certain that it was only at the beginning of the fourteenth century that the Greek Schism prevailed in the Muscovite and contiguous regions. But when that Schism attacked the eastern provinces of Poland, the Latin Poles began to look askance at their brethren of the Greco-Slavonic rite, even when these latter were as devotedly Roman as themselves. In the minds of the Latins the Greek and

really the chief engine of the imperial machinery; the most powerful instrument wielded by the Russian police. As an instance of the way in which religion is made a mere instrument of Russian statecraft, we may adduce the formal obligation laid upon confessors, under pain of death, to reveal to the government any conspiracy which may come to their knowledge in the tribunal of penance (Tondini, *The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Orthodox Church*, p. 166, Paris, 1874). It certainly seems strange that the prelates who sit in the Holy Synod, who term themselves the successors of Sts. Athanasius and John Damascene, can take this oath when they assume office: "I profess and swear that the supreme judge of this Synod is the most clement emperor of all Russia." The newspapers of Russia regard the slavery of the Holy Synod as a matter of course and an excellent thing. When Protasoff, a colonel of hussars, and president of the Synod, died in 1860, the very orthodox journal, the *Nord*, of February 2d, thus eulogized him: "He was in fact, if not in name, the head of the Orthodox Russian Church. With his firm and energetic will he knew how to gain victory over the retrograde tendencies of the elder clergy. By means of the Synod, of which he was the veritable head, he distributed the bishoprics among the young and civilized clergy, he reorganized completely the system of education in the seminaries and academies," etc. With a colonel of hussars at its head it is no wonder that the Russian Church began to exhibit a "young and civilized clergy" impregnated with anti-Christian rationalism. Tolstoy, the successor of this Tartar rough-rider, was not a colonel, but although a mere lay civilian, he was able to prosecute the work of "civilization" among his subjects.

its derivative rites began to be synonymous with schism and heresy, and in the course of time this feeling was intensified, especially after the collapse of the reunion which had been proclaimed by the General Council of Florence in 1439, and which had been announced at Moscow by the patriarch Isidore. In 1595 several Polish schismatic dioceses, nearly all Ruthenian, returned to the fold *en masse*, having become disgusted with the exactions of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Moscow.[1] Unfortunately, the converts did not experience at the hands of the Polish senate and aristocracy—all the members of which bodies were of the Latin rite—the consideration which they deserved; even the Latin clergy were more or less suspicious of a rite which seemed to render the Ruthenians akin to the schismatics. Both laity and clergy were less wise than the Holy See, which has ever strenuously defended the attachment of the orientals to their ancient rites, and has wished to perpetuate those rites as living testimonies to the Apostolicity of Roman doctrine. The result of this coolness toward the United Greeks was the gradual passage of all the Ruthenian nobility to the Latin rite, so that at the time of the partition of Poland the United Greek rite had come to be regarded as peculiar to the serfs, and therefore did not enjoy that perfect equality with the Latin before the law to which it had a right. However, the Poles had never persecuted either the United Greeks or the schismatics, as is asserted by Golovine, Dimitri Tolstoy and other "orthodox" writers, in an endeavor to justify the bloody deeds of the children of the Holy Synod in Poland. In spite of the repugnance of both the nobility and the serfs for everything which smacked of Constantinople or Moscow, the Polish kings allowed a schismatic hierarchy to subsist among the Ruthenians at the side of the Greek United. The schismatic University of Kiew was endowed by Ladislas IV. in 1645, with immense wealth, and he established in it a complete printing-plant. John Casimir, who was a cardinal before he became king, allowed the schismatic metropolitan of Kiew to place himself under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Moscow. This toleration did not injure the Catholic cause in Poland. It was only when Poland was dismembered that the steady progress of the United Greeks was reversed; then, indeed, had not some of the United Greek dioceses fallen to the share of Austria, nearly every vestige of Ruthenian Catholicism would have vanished.[2]

[1] Rahocza, primate of Kiew, had convoked all his suffragans to a council in Brzesc, and there they proclaimed their submission to the Holy See. These bishops were those of Kiew, Wlademir and Brzesc, Luck and Ostrog, Polock and Witepsk, Przemyl and Sambor, Leopol, Chelm and Belz, and Pinsk and Turow.

[2] Whenever the student faces a question involving the relations between the Holy See and any of the oriental Christian peoples, or any of the peoples who have de-

At the time of the first partition of Poland between Russia, Austria and Prussia (August 5, 1772) the doomed kingdom had eighteen millions of inhabitants, of whom twelve millions were Catholics, about three millions were "Orthodox" schismatics, about one million Protestants, and the remainder either Jews or Mussulmans. In the supplementary treaty between the royal brigands, which was dated September 18, 1773, the Russian empress promised full toleration to her new subjects of the Catholic faith; but the Poles had not forgotten the words with which Catharine had despatched her Zaparogue Cossacks into Poland in 1768: "We have ordered Maximilian Zelezniak, colonel of the Zaparogues, to lead into Poland his men, together with the Cossacks of the Don, and with the grace of God to destroy all the Poles and Jews who are traitors to our holy religion—those miserable assassins, men of perfidy, audacious violators of every law, who protect the false religion of the Jews and oppress a faithful and innocent people. We order that this invasion into Poland destroy forever their name and race." The Poles remembered that these Zaparogues had slaughtered, under the guidance of their "popes," 200,000 defenceless victims of both sexes and of every age,[1] and therefore they were not astounded when, the ink of the treaty of toleration being scarcely dry, out of 1900 churches which the United Greeks possessed in Ukraine, more than 1200 were handed over to the schismatics, their priests being persecuted and sometimes tortured until they signed promises of fidelity to the Church of Holy Russia. Facts like these had been sufficiently eloquent to justify the words of Maria Teresa: "It is very embarrassing to negotiate with the czarina, because she promises mountains and wonders, and then orders her ministers and generals to do the contrary of what she promised, as we have seen too frequently in the matter of the persecutions visited by the Russians

---

rived their rites from the East, he must bear in mind one eloquent fact: Many years before the separation of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate from the centre of unity the orientals had begun to think more of their rites than of dogmas, and since the religious idea was with them the idea of country, their peculiar rites became, perhaps more than did their dogmas of faith, their symbols of nationality. Very easily, therefore, they began to regard peoples of different rites from their own as both heretics and political enemies. In illustration of what is more interesting to us—their proneness to think more of rite than of dogma—we shall cite a couple of cases. When Michael Cerularius separated definitively his patriarchate from the Chair of Peter, he assigned as his chief reasons the use of unleavened bread by the Latins as matter of the Eucharist, their use of *lacticinia* in Lent, their suppression of the *Alleluia* during that season. The great reformer and robber of the Muscovite Church, Ivan the Terrible, in an edict of 1551, ordered his subjects to credit the following absurdity: "Among all the customs of heretics none is so condemnable as that of shaving the beard. (Peter the Great, another Head of the Russian Church, thought differently.) The effusion of all a martyr's blood would not atone for this crime."

[1] The Russian official reports spoke of 50,000.

on the persons and churches of the United Greeks."[1] Such facts, however, had caused Voltaire to write to the "Semiramis of the North" that happy indeed would be the man who would write her history (December 3, 1771); and, again, those words which would be blasphemous if their author had not been animated, in all probability, by the spirit of *opera bouffe:* "I have only a little of the breath of life left in me; but while dying, I shall use it to invoke you as a saint, certainly the greatest saint ever produced by the north" (July 13, 1772). But the twenty years that intervened between the first and second partitions of Poland were years of calm for her Catholics, when compared with the sufferings which the "divine" czarina inflicted on them after the latter robbery. By the treaty of Grodno, concluded in 1793, Prussia obtained a compensation for her Rhenish provinces, just subjugated by France, in the acquisition of all that is now the province of Posen, while Russia received half of Lithuania, together with all Volhynia, Podolia and Polish Ukraine. Again Catharine II. promised perfect toleration to "the Roman Catholic religion of *both rites*"; but immediately after the signing of the treaty she convoked an assembly of "Orthodox" prelates at St. Petersburg for the purpose of devising sure means for the severance of the Uniates from the Roman communion. That plan seemed most feasible which was devised by Eugene Bulgari, a native of Corfu, whose philosophic sympathies had won for him the friendship of the Prussian Frederick II., and whom that prince had recommended to the notice of the czarina. By the advice of Bulgari, an establishment of "missionaries," richly endowed, was founded in the newly-acquired provinces, and placed under the charge of a bishop named Sadkowski. This apostle of "Orthodoxy" announced his arrival to his new flock by a violent pastoral against all communion with Rome, in which he promised great rewards to the Uniates who would join the Church of Holy Russia, and soon afterward bands of soldiers, each accompanied by one or more Russian popes, began the work of "conversion." Every Ruthenian priest who remained faithful to the Chair of Peter was either thrust into prison or was banished, and ere long there were few Uniates, publicly known as such, in the dioceses of the Ukraine or in those of Luck, Wladimir, Chelm in Volhynia, or Kamieniec in Podolia. Only in the diocese of Polock did the "Orthodox" missionaries meet with many failures, for there the civil authorities proved less docile instruments of the czarina than their colleagues—a fact which would have entailed their ruin had not Catharine died in 1796.

No narrative of the relations between Catharine II. and her

[1] Theiner: *Pontificate of Clement XIV.*, vol. ii., p. 437.

Catholic subjects would be complete without some account of the too famous Siestrzencewicz. This unfortunate personage was born in 1731 of Calvinist parents; and after some studies in Germany and England, undertaken with a view of becoming a Protestant minister, he suddenly entered the Prussian army as an officer. He soon abandoned the service of the Brandenburgers for that of Poland; and he had attained the rank of captain, when he resigned and became a tutor for the children of Prince Radziwill. Perceiving a chance of obtaining the hand of a wealthy lady, he abjured Protestantism; but the chance having disappeared, he followed the advice of the Uniate bishop of Wilna, and received Holy Orders in 1763. When the first partition of Poland took place, the bishop of Wilna, who had the utmost confidence in Siestrzencewicz, desired to have him as a suffragan, charged with the administration of that part of the diocese which had been annexed to Russia. At this time the Latin Catholics of White Russia had no bishop of their own rite; they were under the jurisdiction of the Uniate bishops of Wilna, Livonia, and Smolensk. But scarcely had Catharine taken possession of the country, when, on September 14, 1772, she announced that the Latins would soon receive at her hands a bishop for themselves; but in fact another ukase soon informed all the Latins of the Russian empire, whether they were Poles or not, that her majesty's solicitude for their spiritual welfare had prompted her to place them under the episcopal care of Siestrzencewicz. This imperial appointment was, of course, null in the eyes of Garampi, the papal nuncio at Warsaw; but this prelate devised a means of preserving the dignity of the Holy See, while at the same time he obviated the anger which, were Catharine thwarted, would be visited on her Catholic subjects. He ordered the United Greek bishops of Wilna, Livonia, and Smolensk, to delegate to Siestrzencewicz their own jurisdiction over the Latins of White Russia, while he conferred upon him spiritual faculties for the other Latins of the empire. In 1776 a new nuncio, Archetti, arrived in Warsaw, and he at once realized that one bishop was not adequate to the needs of all the Latins in Russia. He found, however, that Catharine was determined to allow only two Catholic bishops in her entire empire—one Latin, and one United Greek. In 1779, wishing to reward Siestrzencewicz for having helped her in snubbing the court of Spain,[1] she announced him as archbishop of Mohi-

[1] The reader must know that Catharine had refused to allow the promulgation, in her dominions, of the Brief whereby Pope Clement XIV. had suppressed the Society of Jesus, on July 21, 1773; and that the Jesuits in Russia had continued in the exercise of their rule. When consulted by Siestrzencewicz as to how these clergymen should be regarded, the nuncio replied that they were secular priests, and should be regarded as such. This decision was ratified by Opizio Pallavicini, the papal secre-

lew, and demanded the pallium for him from the Holy See. On September 16, 1780, the Pontiff wrote to the empress trying to dissuade her from the promotion contemplated; and Catharine replied, reiterating her demand, and promising that if it were granted, she would indeed protect her Catholic subjects. The Pope considered the matter during ten months, and finally, in October, 1780, he consented to erect Mohilew into a metropolitan see, but he refused to grant the pallium to Siestrzencewicz. Two years of fruitless negotiation now passed; and one day Count Stackelberg waited on Archetti, and read to him, in accordance with Catharine's commands, a letter which he had just received from her. In this document, dated November 15, 1782, Catharine impudently declared that if the Roman Pontiff exercised any authority in Russia, it was by her favor; and that if her demands were not satisfied immediately, she would suppress the Catholic worship in every quarter of her dominions. Of course the Pontiff yielded; the debated point was not an essential one, and there was a question of the salvation of souls. On January 11, 1783, Pius VI. wrote to Catharine that for the sake of religion he would forget the injuries which the Holy See had received from Siestrzencewicz, and would make that prelate metropolitan of Mohilew. In order, however, that Catholic discipline might be thoroughly observed, he would appoint as nuncio to St. Petersburg the present nuncio at Warsaw, Mgr. Archetti. In the beginning of the following July Archetti arrived in the Russian capital, and was received by the empress in full court.

When the Holy See consented to make Siestrzencewicz archbishop of Mohilew, it also appointed, at the request of Catharine, a coadjutor to him in the person of Benislawski, an ex-Jesuit; and this appointment proved providential, for in later days the coadjutor often neutralized the evil influence of his superior. In the ukase whereby Catharine "erected" the archbishopric of Mohilew, we read two articles which fully illustrate the pretensions which she advanced, and which the Russian government of to-day advances, to a right of interference in the religious affairs of even the Catholic dioceses of the empire. "Art. 12. The archbishop is commanded to send to the court a detailed account of the state of all his religious; he will describe those who teach the young, those who aid the sick and poor, and who thus merit the protection of the government; he will also make known those who pass their

tary of state. Very soon, however, Siestrzencewicz, who had hitherto been hostile to the Jesuits, manifested great affection for them, in order to please his imperial protectress. He issued an order, authorizing the Jesuits of White Russia to open a novitiate in Polotzk. This action greatly disturbed Pope Pius VI.; for the Spanish court was as indignant as the Muscovite autocrat was elated.

time in idleness, and are of no use to their fellow-men. Art. 13. *The reception of Bulls and Briefs from the Pope is prohibited.* Such Bulls and Briefs are to be sent immediately to the Senate, which body, after it has seen that they contain nothing contrary to the laws of the land or to the power which God has given to the monarch, will communicate them to the throne, and wait for permission to publish them." Siestrzencewicz complied with these and similar demands; and therefore it is natural that the apologists of the Russian Establishment should laud him, as does Dimitry Tolstoy, procurator-general of the Holy Synod under Alexander II., when, in his "History of Roman Catholicism in Russia" (1864), he represents the courtier-prelate as sharing the glory of Catharine II. in laboring for "the reformation *and civilization* of the Catholic clergy," rendered hitherto so vile and barbarous by the influence of Rome. Tolstoy says that "*to the great astonishment of the Latin fanatics*, Siestrzencewicz never veiled his sympathies for a *wise civilization;* and this was so strange in the eyes of his brethren, that they could explain it only by the supposition that he had secretly apostatized from the Roman communion, for, *according to them, intellect and science are incompatible with faith.*" This judgment of a Muscovite on the countrymen and fellow-clerics of Copernicus may cause a smile; but one is disgusted when the practical head of the Russian Church asserts that "this enlightened bishop was capable of appreciating the eminent sovereign, and of *seconding her benevolent intentions for the good of her Roman Catholic subjects.*" Count Joseph de Maistre had come to know Siestrzencewicz well during the years that he spent in St. Petersburg as the ambassador of the king of Sardinia; and in 1819, seven years before the death of the prelate, he wrote, in his letter on *The Condition of Christianity in Europe*, the following estimate of the character of Catharine's adjutant in the religious campaign against the Poles: "There is at present in Russia a very fantastical personage who could not be found in any other time or country. He is the archbishop of Mohilew, the Catholic primate of all the Russias, who was a Protestant and an officer of cavalry before he became a bishop. He is an instrument in the hands of our enemies, and a thousand times more dangerous than if he were a Protestant by profession. His servility would disgust a *noble* government, one for which mere obedience suffices. He is always ready to contradict, and even to defy the Holy See, because he knows that he will always be sustained. It is he who, one day as the emperor passed, cried out: 'Behold my Pope!' The witnesses of this admirable profession of faith are still living in St. Petersburg. In one of his pastorals this strange bishop presumed to falsify a text of the Council of Trent, and also a passage from a let-

ter of Pope Pius VI. Because of this double *mistake*, if that word suffices, the reigning Pontiff (Pius VII.) could not avoid sending to him a Brief of reprobation, ordering him to retract; but he, knowing that he would be upheld, laughed at the Brief, and made no retractation." Tolstoy reproduces a long memorial by Siestrzencewicz on *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the Empire*, from which we take the following passage as illustrative of the prelate's appreciation of Canon Law, and of his conception of the proper relations between Church and State: "In return for the daily bread which nourishes him (Catharine paid *him* 60,000 roubles a year), and because of the security allowed him in the empire, an ecclesiastic owes obedience and fidelity to the sovereign. He is not obliged to know all the laws, but only those which concern him, and which regard the maintenance of the Church and the clergy. Consequently, the Canon Law must be taught in the seminary, *within the limits which will be prescribed by the sovereign.*" The reader will take notice that this last clause is italicized, not by us, but by the procurator-general of the Holy Synod; and he quite properly asked for special attention to it, for it is an epitome of his hero's entire episcopal teaching. In this memorial there is another passage which also merits italicization, and chiefly because it sounds like an excerpt from Voltaire. Just as Tolstoy contends that "in the schools of the Latins the intellect is purposely obscured," so Siestrzencewicz emits this raving: "In our day, *when men so justly complain of the decadence and corruption of the monastic classes*, and when scarcely any one thinks of some way of rendering them useful to the country, Providence has designed that *in the Golden Age of Russia, Catharine the Immortal should make them benefit her other subjects.*" It is no wonder that Catharine found in Siestrzencewicz an accomplice in all her schemes for the reduction of the Latin Catholics to servitude, for the absorption of the Uniates by the "Orthodox" Church, and for the utter annihilation of the pontifical authority in her dominions.

Throughout his work Dimitry Tolstoy shows us that he cares more for the fancied interests of his imperial master than he cares for the real rights of conscience, and that his inveterate prejudices, nourished in the darkness of schism, dread the light of historical truth. The following passage is interesting, both because of its naive admissions and because of the inconsistency of which it is redolent:

"By the first partition, in 1772, Russia acquired White Russia, which formed only a part of the diocese of Wilna. The first act of the Russian government was to guarantee freedom of worship in those provinces, *and to organize the hierarchical administration of the Roman Church.* . . . . Far from attacking the dogmas and rites of the Latin population of White Russia, Catharine, on the contrary, strengthened them by

the institution of a hierarchy; *but she refused to recognize the right of Rome, under pretext of religion, to have anything to do with the discipline of the Latin Church in her empire.* Following the example of the principal states of the Roman communion, she ordered, in 1772, that no Bull or Brief from the court of Rome, no commands of foreign ecclesiastical authorities, should be published in White Russia without the permission of the governor-general and the sovereign sanction. *This important measure, which utterly reversed the relations of the Polish higher clergy with the government and with the court of Rome,* which hitherto had ruled absolutely through its nuncio at Warsaw, *became a fundamental law of the empire.* This law was always confirmed by all the successors of Catharine, despite certain variations in the administration of the Church. *It exists at present, and it is to be hoped that it will never be changed in the future.*"

According to Tolstoy, therefore, Catharine is to be praised for a spirit of toleration, when she violated her solemn promise of toleration by "reorganizing the hierarchical administration of the Roman Church"; when she effected this "reorganization" in such a manner that she "utterly reversed the relations of the Polish higher clergy with the court of Rome"; when she absolutely severed the tie of obedience and respect which bound her Catholic subjects to the earthly head of their Church; when she took as her guides the philosophistic, Febronian and Josephistic (nominally Catholic) statesmen, whose maxims the Church condemned. This conduct of Catharine, according to Tolstoy, was "not an attack on the dogmas and rites" of Catholics, but rather a "strengthening" of them; and, nevertheless, Tolstoy knew that the supremacy of the Pope—and, consequently, his right to command in matters of discipline, just as in matters of faith—forms part of Catholic dogma. But Tolstoy held a brief as an advocate of the State Church of Russia. And he was faithful to his commission when, with an audacity which has been rarely equalled, he declared:

"We should not forget that the regeneration of the Catholic Church in Russia, *whose decadence was so manifest at the end of the last century,* was inaugurated by a sovereign who did not belong to that Church."

Tolstoy proclaims the name of this murderous and lubricious woman as "venerable"; but Catholics remember that when she left the embraces of her last paramour for those of death—a death which reminds us of that of Arius—she could reflect that since the Treaty of Grodno, signed three years previously, she had forced four-fifths of her Uniate subjects into the ranks of "Orthodoxy." She had strangled their faith as remorselessly as she had strangled her imperial husband; and the hundreds who had perished on the scaffold or under the knout, the fourteen thousand who were undergoing a living death in Siberia, the other thousands whose noses and ears had been cut off after they were de-

prived of their flocks—their sole means of subsistence—would scarcely have termed her "venerable."

Paul I., the successor of Catharine II., ridded the administration of nearly all the creatures of his abominable mother, but among the few who succeeded in retaining their positions was the infamous Siestrzencewicz. Paul would have enforced the provisions for toleration which Catharine had signed and then ignored, had he not been influenced by the wily prelate, who hoped to secure for himself a patriarchate under the ægis of the civil power. When Paul requested and obtained from Pope Pius VI. the residence of a papal nuncio in his capital, Siestrzencewicz used every means to thwart the prelate, and finally procured his dismissal. He then drew up a series of regulations for the government of the Catholics in the empire, which rendered him, under the czar, their absolute master. Thus, every appeal from an episcopal decision was to be addressed to the Catholic Department of the College of Justice, and the president of this tribunal was Siestrzencewicz himself. For a time the Catholics breathed more freely, when Paul, heeding the complaints of the Jesuits, deprived his Grace of Mohilew of the presidency in the college, and conferred it on his coadjutor, Benislawski. But with the accession of Alexander I. to the throne, Siestrzencewicz returned to power. By a ukase of November 1, 1801, the Catholic Department of the College of Justice gave place to a Catholic College, which, sitting at St. Petersburg, was to be for all the Catholics in Russia what the Holy Synod was in regard to the schismatics. In the formation of this new tribunal Siestrzencewicz carefully ignored all who had any reputation for morality or honor. One of the members was his brother, a Protestant, and of very evil repute; another, a notoriously dissolute monk, apostatized and married soon after his appointment. However, in spite of the all-but openly schismatic tendencies of their primate, the Catholics of Russia complained but little during the reign of Alexander I. So far as his surroundings would permit, this czar ever manifested a sincere desire to respect the religious convictions of those whom his "popes" represented as the most dangerous enemies of his empire; and it is not strange that during the last years of his life there were rumors of his conversion, and that when he died (in 1825) these rumors attained greater consistency.[1]

The great work which Catharine II. had initiated, the destruction of the Greek Uniate Church, had been interrupted by the

[1] Relying on the testimony of the Abbé, Prince Hohenlohe, who had been intimate with this czar, Rohrbacher says that the Catholic faith had been embraced not only by Alexander, long before his death, but also by the czarina, Elizabeth, a princess of the House of Baden.

comparatively tolerant reigns of Paul I. and Alexander I.; but it was resumed by Nicholas I., and with similar but more cunningly-devised means. Catharine began the work with the aid of that Siestrzencewicz whom De Maistre rightly termed "a Protestant in disguise," and Nicholas finished it with the aid of another Uniate traitor, Siemaszko. The plan which Siemaszko, then an assessor in the Catholic College of which we have spoken, submitted to Nicholas, has been revealed in our day by Moroschkine, a Russian schismatic priest,[1] and it refutes completely the assertions of Tolstoy and other official "Orthodox" writers that in the contest between Catholicism and "Orthodoxy" it was the former that first assumed the aggressive by troubling the peace of the latter. "*The Empress Catharine*," writes Siemaszko to Nicholas, "*did not hesitate to proclaim aloud that it was her intention to extirpate the Union in the annexed provinces.* With this idea, firstly, she enfeebled the action, without suppressing it, of the ecclesiastical authority of the United Greeks, and secondly, she prevented the clergy and nobility of the Latin rite from exercising any influence on the consciences of the Catholics of the Slavonic rite. When, in 1794, the synod received an order to publish an appeal to the people in the newly-acquired provinces, it was to exhort them to embrace Orthodoxy. Her Majesty, on her side, ordered the governor, Toutolmine, to assist the synod. She recommended him to watch carefully, *lest any proprietor or employee, ecclesiastical or civil, of either one of the rites of the Catholic religion, should dare offer the least opposition to those who might wish to embrace Orthodoxy.* She added that the slightest attempt at such a thing, being a hostility to the dominant religion, and contrary to her formal desires, would be considered a capital crime, to be brought before the tribunals, and involving a confiscation of property until the judicial decision should be rendered. *This menace, joined to the state of siege in which the provinces then were, produced its effect. Very soon Orthodox dioceses arose in the government of Minsk, and, above all, in Volhynia and Podolia.*" This passage needs no comment, but mark how Siemaszko admits that after the death of Catharine "conversions to Orthodoxy" almost ceased. "*After the death of the empress*, the vigilance of the authorities being relaxed, a great reaction occurred. . . . *The conversions of the Uniates to the dominant Church ceased, while returns to the Latin rite were numerous. From that time there was no instance of an entire parish, or even of part of one, going over to the Russian Church, but there were many instances of the contrary. . . . From time to time entire communities passed to*

[1] In an article entitled "The Reunion of the Union," in the *European Messenger*, of St. Petersburg, 1872, cited by Father Martinov, S.J., in his work, *The Plan for the Abolition of the United Greek Church*, Paris, 1878.

the Uniates, leaving empty churches to the Russo-Greek clergy." This avowal of Siemaszko scarcely accords with the claims of Tolstoy, or with the impudent assertion of Catharine, that "the Uniates awaited a propitious occasion that they might return to a Church which they had abandoned with regret, and only in order to escape persecution."[1] The plan of Siemaszko for the wholesale perversion of the Uniates embraced four points: Firstly, a United Greek College was to be established; that is, instead of the United Greek section in that Catholic College which managed the religious affairs of the Russian Catholics, there would be instituted a distinct College, the mission of which would be to guard against the introduction of any new features in the United Greek rite, and to watch over the exact observance of all its ancient features. Secondly, the number of Uniate dioceses was to be diminished, and only *reliable* men (that is, men of the stamp of Siemaszko) were to be placed over them. Thirdly, the ecclesiastical schools of the Uniates were to be so guarded that it would be impossible for their students to ever hold the slightest communication with those who followed the Latin rite. Fourthly, and above all, insisted Siemaszko, in order to prevent conversions from "Orthodoxy" to Catholicism, the monks of the Order of St. Basil should be reduced in number, and those allowed to subsist should be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of their provincials. In accordance with this plan, Nicholas I. promulgated, on April 22, 1828, that ukase which Pope Gregory XVI., in his Allocution of July 22, 1842, described as having, by its institution of the United Greek College, "imposed on the bishops, in the exercise of their authority, a nearly absolute subjection to the Russian government." After the establishment of this governmental bureau, other persecuting enactments appeared as its logical consequences. The bishops and superiors of religious houses were forbidden to exercise any supervision over the education of the secular or regular clergy. Episcopal sees were systematically left vacant or filled by either incapable or unworthy persons. The property of convents and monasteries was repeatedly sequestrated. Thousands of children were deported to the interior of Russia, to be trained in the maxims of "Orthodoxy." Siberia was the destination of anyone who endeavored to convert an "Orthodox" person to Catholicism. All children born of mixed marriages were to be raised in the National Church. Mixed marriages were regarded as null unless celebrated before an "Orthodox" pastor. No Catholic priest could hear the confession of a person who was unknown

[1] In her letter to Stackelberg, her ambassador to the Roman court, November 4, 1782. The context of the letter shows that its lies were intended for the ears of Pope Pius VI.

to him, nor could he administer the Holy Eucharist to such a person. Such was the legislation which, crowned by the apostasy of three bishops in 1839, brought almost total ruin upon the Ruthenian Church.

In 1830 Siemaszko was appointed suffragan to the metropolitan of Lithuania, who consented to the governmental action, only because the ambitious prelate swore to beseech the Pontiff to grant the canonical institution. It may be superfluous to remark that the oath was broken. An apostate provincial of the Basilian monks, and a few other corrupt Uniates, were found to be willing to accept mitres in return for the sacrifice of their apostolic liberty; and the work of robbing the Ruthenians of their most precious treasure proceeded with rapidity. Like all other schisms and heresies, the "Orthodox" Church waded in the blood of Catholic martyrs ere it triumphed in White Russia. Our limits allow us to cite only a few of the more prominent illustrations of the fidelity of the Ruthenians to the Chair of Peter. In April, 1834, fifty-four priests of the district of Novogrodek handed to Siemaszko a firm protest against his innovations. The wretch proceeded to violence; a few yielded, but the majority set out on the weary march for Siberia. One of the accomplices of this Polish Cranmer, Luzienski, bishop of Polotsk, made a number of his clergy drunk, and then wheedled from them a renunciation of the Roman communion. When the priests of the districts of Drisna and Lepel heard of this proceeding, they protested before God and man; then the imperial authorities transferred their churches to the schismatics. The district of Witepsk had for many years been attended by the Lazarists; but these devoted sons of St. Vincent de Paul had been banished in 1832. Shortly after the Easter of 1835, an imperial commissioner, accompanied by a company of soldiers, entered the church and informed the people that it was the will of their father, the czar, that they should embrace his religion. When they refused, the military fell on them; many expired in the house of God, but many others fled to a neighboring pond, which was covered by a thin coating of ice. The commissioner ordered them to yield, but they replied that they would die rather than abandon the Catholic religion. Then the soldiers broke the ice; some of the unfortunates swam to the shore, but twenty-two found their martyrs' crowns in their watery graves. At Starosiel, a military colony, the commander informed his men, one day, that the czar had determined that they should adore his God. The simple-minded Poles replied that they did adore the same Christ, the Redeemer, whom the czar adored. "That is not enough," retorted the general; "you must adore God according to the regulations—in the manner decreed by the czar." The puzzled

men exclaimed that Christ had not instituted the czar as Chief Pastor for His flock. "I know nothing about that," returned the commander, "nor do I wish to know anything about it. I know only my orders. Obey!" Most of the soldiers declared that they would die sooner than abandon their religion; whereupon the "Orthodox" ones fell upon them with clubs and swords, and another band of martyrs ascended to heaven. After seven years of persecution of this sort, Siemaszko could boast that in White Russia and Lithuania eight hundred and eighty-six parishes had passed from the obedience of the Vicar of Christ to that of the czar of Russia; and then he and Luzienski ordered their clergy to sign *An Act of Union With the Russian Church.* In the province of Mohilew every priest spurned the document, and one hundred and sixty of them were sent to Siberia, where most of them died. In 1838 the Uniate bishop of Brest joined Siemaszko and Luzienski at Polotsk; and having signed the *Act of Union*, they endeavored to procure the adhesion of the venerable metropolitan, Bulhak, to whom Siemaszko was coadjutor. The czar tried in vain to bribe Bulhak with the *cordon* of St. Andrew, a decoration which was given only to princes of the blood, and with a promise of the see of St. Petersburg. When Siemaszko dangled this latter bait before his eyes, the old man asked: "You offer me the highest dignity in the Russian Church; but who will give me eternal salvation, if I violate my conscience?" And he immediately drew up an act of solemn protestation against the proceedings of his suffragans. That same night, Bloudow, minister of the interior, entered the bedroom of the archbishop, unannounced, and ordered him, in the name of the czar, to sign the *Act of Union.* The prelate calmly replied: "No human power shall induce me to proclaim my separation from the Universal Church—from Christ Himself. If others do so, and the government publishes their apostasy, I, at least, solemnly protest against their conduct." Siemaszko advised the czar to proceed to extremes, but Nicholas reflected that Bulhak was revered by schismatics as well as by Catholics, and he preferred to allow a natural death, which could not be far distant, to free him from the last firm support of the Ruthenian Church. The prelate went to his reward at the close of that year, and then the czar gave him a gorgeous funeral, in order that the people might believe the government's assertion that he had finally entered the State Church of Holy Russia. On February 24, 1839, the three episcopal apostates published their *Act of Union.* It was benignly received by Colonel Protasoff, the head of the Holy Synod; and from that day the apologists of the czarate have continually asserted, and Russian school children have been continually

taught, that during the reign of the ever-memorable (*nezabvenny*) Czar Nicholas I. nearly two millions of Ruthenians "returned" to the Orthodox Church spontaneously and gratefully.

The Polish Catholics of the Latin rite had their share of suffering during the reign of Nicholas I. as well as those of the Greek rite. The suppression of all the religious orders, announced in 1828, was effected in 1832. The incumbent of the metropolitan see of Mohilew, Cieciszowski, a most worthy man, a living contradiction of his predecessor, Siestrzencewicz, was prevented by the infirmities of age from administering the diocese; and when his auxiliary, Szyt, showed that his attachment to the Holy See was invincible, he was deported into the depths of Russia. When the see became vacant, Nicholas named for it the bishop of Kaminiec, Paulowski, who had been so subservient to his majesty as to order his clergy to observe the ukase of March 28, 1836, which forbade the priests of the Latin rite to administer the Sacraments to the Uniates. In 1841 Pope Gregory XVI. deemed it wise to grant a Brief for the canonical institution of Paulowski, and for this act he has been blamed by many Catholic publicists, notably by the generally judicious French historian, Rohrbacher. Certainly appearances were against the venerable Pontiff, when many devoted children of the Holy See, regarding things from a lower standpoint than that which he occupied, insinuated that his invincible opposition to all revolutionary manœuvres had rendered him an unwitting accomplice of the Russian persecutor. But listen to the apostolic simplicity and vigor with which Gregory XVI. explained his position in his Allocution to the Sacred College, delivered on July 22, 1842.

"He whose unworthy vicar on earth we are knows well that from the moment of our elevation to the Supreme Pontificate we have neglected nothing which zeal and solicitude could suggest as remedies for the ever-increasing evils of the day. But what has been the result of all our labors? Facts, and very recent ones, tell us too plainly. . . . . The public has no knowledge of all that we have done, unceasingly and determinedly, in order to protect and defend, in all the regions subjected to the Russian domination, the inviolable rights of the Catholic Church. All this has been unknown, especially in those regions; and it has come to pass, for the increase of our grief, that among the faithful dwelling there in such great numbers, the enemies of the Holy See, with that hereditary deceit (*avita fraude*) which distinguishes them, have spread the report that we, forgetful of our sacred ministry, have ignored the misfortunes which have overwhelmed those peoples, and that thus we have almost abandoned the cause of the Catholic religion. So far has this matter been carried, that we have become almost a stumbling-block for a considerable portion of the flock of our Lord. . . . . Since such is the state of things, we owe to God, to religion, and to ourselves, that we repel even the suspicion of so grievous a delinquency. With this object, we have ordered that there be given to each one of you, Venerable Brothers, a complete exposition of all that we have done in behalf of the Catholic Church in the empire of Russia. Thus it will be made plain to all the faithful throughout the world, that we have been in no way neglectful of our Apostolic duties."

The publication of this exposition, which was a precise and thoroughly substantiated arraignment of the Russian government before the bar of Christianity and civilization, was a fearful blow for Nicholas I. One of his greatest anxieties had been caused by the fear lest his imitations of Nero and Diocletian should become known in Western Europe. He had succeeded in hiding them, thanks to the complicity of his Protestantizing brother-in-law, the king of Prussia; thanks also to the minister of Austria, that Metternich who rivalled even Nicholas in hatred of every true independence of thought; but thanks, above all, to the interested silence of nearly the entire press of Europe, which, in the hands of Freemasons and Jews, never condemned any injuries done to Catholics, just as to-day it says nothing when Cossacks bayonet the infants of Polish Catholics, while it wails through many columns of exaggerations on the woes which Eastern schismatics have brought upon themselves at the hands of the Turks. The language of the Papal Secretary of State was calm and dignified, but it carried conviction to the heart of every reader. Nicholas thought it would be a grand stroke of policy were he to show the world that he did not hesitate to justify himself in the very face of his accuser. We do not know the details of that interview which Pope Gregory XVI. granted to his Russian majesty in December, 1845. In his "Last Four Popes," Cardinal Wiseman says:

"What were the emperor's intentions, what his ideas, what his desires in coming to Rome, and having necessarily a personal meeting with the Pope, it is impossible to conjecture. Did he hope to overcome him by his splendid presence, truly majestic, soldier-like and imperial? Or to cajole and win him by soothing speeches and insincere promises? Or to gain the interpretative approval of silence and forbearance? One must conjecture in vain. Certain it is that he came, he saw, and conquered not. It has been already mentioned that the subject and particulars of the conference were never revealed by its only witness at Rome. The Pope's own account was brief, simple, and full of conscious power: 'I said to him all that the Holy Ghost dictated to me.' And that he had not spoken vainly, with words that had beaten the air, but that their strokes had been well placed and driven home, there was evidence otherwise recorded. An English gentleman was in some part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview, and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand as it was from statue-like features, stately frame, and martial bearing; free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of anterooms, the imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, 'with plumes unruffled, and with eye unquenched,' in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever wearied, of beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again, with head uncovered, and hair, if it can be said of man, dishevelled; haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting. He waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court, and hurried away from the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, 'from his nest among the stars,' his feathers crumpled, and his eye quelled, by a power till then despised."

Probably this event induced Nicholas to enter into a Concordat with the Holy See in 1847, and to consent to satisfy a few of the claims of the Pontiff. Thus, in Article 12, it was stipulated that the czar would appoint no Catholic bishop without a previous understanding with the Pope; in Article 13 the bishop was recognized as the sole judge of ecclesiastical matters in his diocese, and he was to appoint all the members of his council; in Article 21 the bishop was allowed to supervise the instruction of the ecclesiastical students in his seminary, and he was permitted to select the professors of theology from among the members of the priesthood; and in Article 31 private individuals who wished to spend their own money in defraying the expenses of Catholic worship were graciously allowed to do so, without fear of governmental interference. But at the very moment that this "ever-memorable" head of Russian "Orthodoxy" was doling out his pitiful measure of justice to his Polish subjects in that Concordat which was designed to blind the eyes of Western Europe, he promulgated a code of criminal procedure which was almost worthy of Elizabeth of England. By Article 184 of this code any person who found fault with the "Orthodox" religion lost his civil rights and was doomed to forced labor for six or eight years, while six months or a year of imprisonment awaited him who did not denounce the person whom he had heard pronouncing such sentiments. By Article 187 the commission of this "crime" by writing or printing was punished, in the persons of author or printer, by deportation to Siberia. By Article 193 any persuasion to abandon the Church of the State entailed deportation to Tomsk or Tobolsk; any such persuasion, if savoring of "violence," was to be punished by deportation to Siberia. And the reader will please note that the deprivation of civil rights, as well as the condemnation to Siberia, entailed also a scourging with the knout, which consisted of from eighty to two hundred blows. Of course it is unnecessary to state that the imperial framer of this code did not observe the provisions of the Concordat, trivial though they were.

When Alexander II. succeeded his father, Nicholas I., in 1855, the similarity of his name, and a general belief that his nature was gentle, led the Poles to believe that his reign would be no more oppresssive to them than that of his uncle. But in May, 1856, the future emancipator of the Russian serfs thus addressed the Polish nobility in Warsaw: "I bear you all in my heart, just as I bear the Finlanders and all other Russian subjects; but I intend to maintain the state of affairs which my father established. Therefore, cherish no reveries! I shall know how to restrain those who may continue to indulge in dreams. *The happiness of Poland depends*

on its entire fusion with the rest of my empire. What my father did was well done, and I shall uphold it; my reign will be the continuation of his." Alexander II., however, wished to present an appearance of being willing to satisfy the "legitimate" reclamations of the Holy See. One of his first acts, therefore, was the appointment of a committee, consisting of Nesselrode, Bludoff, the two Kisseleffs, Lanskoi, and the Poles, Turkull and Hubé, which was charged to consider the demands which the Roman Pontiff had continued to make ever since the government of Nicholas I. had signed the Concordat of 1847. We shall notice only a few of these demands, and the treatment which the ostensibly conciliatory committee accorded to them. The first point will scarcely be understood by the Catholic reader. Just as the Holy Synod of the "Orthodox" Church is governed by the czar through the secular procurator-general whom he appoints, so the government of St. Petersburg had for many years attempted to manipulate each Catholic bishop by means of a secretary for his council whom it commissioned, and who was not only a secular, but often a schismatic. To the protest of the Pope against this absurd and outrageous practice the committee replied: "After a minute examination of this matter, the committee finds that our government, *basing its action on the recognized right of all European governments to control the actions of the Catholic Church in their states* (*jus inspectionis*), can, without fear of contradiction, whenever it deems the procedure necessary, appoint its delegates to watch the Catholic consistories, lest they adopt any measures contrary to the existing laws of the empire. If the court of Rome opposes this action, it is not befitting for our government to renounce its prerogatives." To the pontifical demand that when Catholics wished to contract mixed marriages they should be allowed to recur to their own episcopal tribunals, it was replied that such a pretension could not be entertained, *since the spiritual tribunals of the "Orthodox" Church alone had jurisdiction over the two communions.* With some consistency, therefore, the committee reported against granting the papal demand that the czar should withdraw the ukase of 1842, whereby it had been declared that no mixed marriage was valid unless contracted before an "Orthodox" priest. Quite naturally the committee contemned the Pope's insistence that Holy Russia should do what no modern government has yet done, that is, that she should restore the property which she had stolen from the Church. Of course the very "Orthodox" committee did not agree with the Pontiff when he said that apostate Uniates ought not to experience governmental restraint when they wished to return to the Catholic fold. Neither could the committee perceive any reasonableness in the papal wish that the spiritual wants of the

still subsisting United Greeks should be satisfied by Latin bishops, when the government refused to allow them bishops of their own rite. By adopting the advice of this committee, Alexander II. showed how sincere had been the liberal promises which he had made when he mounted the throne; and by this entrance into the way marked out by Catharine II., and so persistently followed by Nicholas I., he deliberately challenged the patience of Poland. Neither the scope of our work nor our limits permit us to detail the terrible events of the Polish insurrection of 1863, but a few words in illustration of its immediate causes will be pertinent to our present subject.

And here at once let us notice an accusation which was brought at that time against the Polish clergy by their "Orthodox" oppressors, and which has been too often repeated by ill-informed publicists in Western Christendom. The Polish clergy were and are styled revolutionists, and, quite reasonably, the European revolutionism of our day is malodorous to Catholic nostrils. *If there was then, or is now, any deficiency of proper spirit in the Polish priesthood, that deficiency exists because the Russian government has for more than a century systematically endeavored to demoralize that priesthood. It has deprived the Polish clergy of every source of instruction and piety, so far as human power could deprive it, by furnishing it with unworthy bishops in too many instances; by suppressing seminaries and religious orders, and by the corrupt maxims which Russian professors have taught to Polish youth.* But it remains to be proved that the Polish clergy have ever knowingly played the game of the Masonic Lodges. The first politico-religious manifestation of 1861 was made in Warsaw. On February 25, 1839, the Poles had defeated the Russians at the gates of Praga, one of the suburbs of the capital, and on the anniversary an immense multitude, headed by many priests, who surrounded the national banner, proceeded to the site to offer prayers for the dead. On the way all chanted the popular and patriotic hymn *Swiety Bozé*, which, as a rule, the Poles never sang in the streets unless in time of epidemic or other public calamity.[1] The

[1] The hymn is as follows: "Holy God, Powerful God, Immortal God, have mercy on us! From pest, fire and war, Lord, deliver us! From sudden and unprovided death, Lord, deliver us! Sinners that we are, we beseech thee, O Lord, to deign to govern and exalt Thy Holy Church! Vouchsafe to render our country to us! Deign to dispose us unto true repentance! Jesus, Jesus, Jesus, have mercy on us! Holy Virgin Mary, Queen of Poland, pray for us!" Hymns in the vernacular have a prominent place in the liturgy of the Poles of the Latin rite. The custom of congregational singing in Polish was introduced in the sixteenth century, in order to combat the influence of the Reformers, who were striving to abolish the Latin liturgy. There is no choir, in our sense of the term, in a Polish church. The organist intones the first words of the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Credo*, etc., in Polish, and the congregation chant the remainder. After each parochial Mass the *Swiety Bozé* precedes the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

service on the place of battle had nearly terminated when Colonel Trepow, the chief of police, arrived with two squadrons of mounted gendarmes. Twice the inoffensive and still praying multitude were charged, and more than forty were either mortally or seriously wounded. On February 27th a funeral service was to be celebrated in the church of the Carmelites for Zawisza, one of the victims of Russian tyranny, and as the procession was nearing the church Trepow attacked it with two squadrons of dragoons. The Poles held their ground, and another procession, issuing from the Church of the Bernardines, distracted the attention of the Cossacks. Wheeling about, the soldiers of Holy Russia fell upon the latter body, forced it back into the church, and galloped after it to the very foot of the altar. Meanwhile the first procession had tried to enter the hall of the Agricultural Society, intending to protest against the sacrilegious violence of the oppressor before the distinguished men who formed that patriotic and philanthropic body, and who were then in session. The President of the Society, Count Andrew Zamoyski, true to his programme of abstention from anything which might serve as an excuse for governmental interference with the beneficent work of his organization, declared the session closed. The members retired, but as they reached the street the soldiers were ordered to fire, and five of them fell dead and more than sixty were wounded. On October 15th, the anniversary of the death of Kosciuszko, a requiem was celebrated in each parish church of Warsaw, when each was surrounded by soldiers, and an order that none of the suppliants should be allowed egress was issued. During seventeen hours the congregations were thus confined, and when, at four in the morning of the 16th, the military entered the sanctuaries, it was for the purpose of dragging more than two thousand innocents to the citadel.[1] The resignation of the people of Warsaw during these days of outrage approached the sublime. So funereal was the aspect of the city that the Russians might have thought their tri-

[1] One of the victims of Cossack brutality on this occasion was an Englishman named G. Mitchell, and he wrote several letters to Earl Russell on the matter, from which we take the following passage: "Who could imagine that the Christian governor of a Christian city would order his Asiatic hordes of hideous savages to trample under their feet a Christian population, an inoffensive people, because it had entered or approached the house of God? When the Russian troops forcibly entered the churches they found kneeling women in the first rows, and behind them were the kneeling men. The women were beaten, and the men were thrown to the floor and trampled under foot. In front of the church of the Bernardines, in the Faubourg of Cracow, Captain Taraskewicz was seen lashing with his whip the women who were trying to escape from the Cossacks by fleeing into the church, and he ordered his men to do the same. . . . After these outrages the churches were despoiled of every object on which the soldiers could lay hands."—*The Events in Warsaw on October* 15, 1861. Paris, 1862.

umph already assured, had not one venerable man raised his voice of protestation in the name of religion and of humanity. With the courage of a Roman martyr defying a proconsul to do his worst, Bialobrzeski, the administrator of the diocese (Archbishop Fialkowski had died on September 25th), handed to the governor a document in which, after an allusion to the desecration of the churches, he said: "These deeds are a disgrace to the soldiers of a civilized government, and make one believe that the days of Attila have returned. But since such are the facts, and since the soldiers menace an unarmed people with their bayonets, I am obliged, in conformity with the mind of the Church, to take measures which will make this justly indignant people realize deeply the barbarity of the outrages which have been perpetrated. I therefore order that all the churches of Warsaw be closed, and I prohibit all services in them. What will be the consequence of this shutting-off from all religious consolation a people who are already so profoundly irritated? I know not; but I do know that nothing can now renew the ties between governed and governing which have been so often and so cruelly broken." In spite of every threat of the government, the order of the administrator was obeyed by the clergy, and the people began to kneel in prayer before the doors which Muscovite cruelty had closed against them. Then a governmental decree forbade all public praying, under pain of the knout and imprisonment; and on November 12th the heroic administrator was thrust into the citadel, the ordinary torments of political prisoners being increased, in his case, by his being deprived of the consolation of his Breviary.[1] His sufferings were of short duration, for since he would not resign his office, and the Chapter would not elect another administrator, he was condemned to death in the following December. Alexander II. now nominated for the see of Warsaw a priest in whom he fancied that he could discern one who would be, if not an instrument of Russia, at least an advocate of a policy of *laissez aller*. Felinski had been one of the few Polish clergymen who blamed Bialobrzeski for closing the churches; and since he had resided outside of Poland for many years, and had judged of matters by official journals and documents, he had come to believe that the conduct of the Polish clergy had not always been noted for prudence. But Mgr. Felinski had scarcely taken possession of his see when he proved to the czar and to the world that he was of the material which furnishes to the Church her Athanasii and her Chrysostoms. At the beginning of May, 1862, the people of Warsaw having signified their intention to honor the Queen of Heaven, in that month which is specially devoted to her praises, by illuminations around

[1] *Ami de la Religion*, January 8, 1862.

all of her statues, the government ordered the archbishop to forbid such demonstrations, declaring also that all ecclesiastics "would be arrested and summarily punished" who contravened the wishes of the czar in the matter. Felinski replied to this insolent command on May 5th, insisting that "it was for the ecclesiastical authorities to superintend the churches," and that "an order to publish police regulations to his flock was an outrage on his episcopal dignity." During the next few days many of the churches were invaded by the police, and in each several worshippers were arrested, in accordance with the formal orders of the chief of police, Pilsudski, to make at least five arrests in each church every evening. In the meantime the archbishop had left the capital for a visitation to a part of his diocese without the permission of the government. Luders, the governor-general, telegraphed several times to the audacious prelate, ordering him to return; but Felinski replied each time that his work was not yet accomplished. These few facts will give an idea of the state of men's minds when, on January 15, 1863, the Russian government began to enforce the law of conscription, and thus precipitated the great insurrection. On May 5th the Grand Duke Constantine, then governor-general, sent for the archbishop, and ordered him to forbid the procession of the coming Feast of Corpus Christi. When the prelate refused, Constantine threatened to place soldiers at the door of every church; then the contributing processions would be unable to join in one grand function. Felinski replied: "Very well, Your Highness. Then I, with the crucifix in my hand, shall be the first to go out of my church; I shall offer my breast to your bayonets, and men will know whether it is Your Highness or I to whom the religious war will be due." The procession took place. In the beginning of June the archbishop was asked by Constantine to degrade from the priesthood a Capuchin named Konarski, who had been condemned to death *by the grand-duke himself*, for having officiated as chaplain in the insurgent army of Langiewicz. The archbishop denied that any secular tribunal could condemn an ecclesiastic to degradation; as for the present case, he knew of no reason why such a sentence should be pronounced. On June 14th Mgr. Felinski was arrested, and soon afterward interned in Jaroslaw.

While persecution was thus raging in the kingdom of Poland, properly so called, the emissaries of the "mild" Alexander II. were carrying fire and sword into the olden Polish provinces beyond the Bug—Lithuania and the Ruthenian countries. The instrument chosen by the cabinet of St. Petersburg to stamp out the insurrection in these regions was Michael Mourawieff, a wealthy scion of a family which has ever been distinguished for its hatred

of everything Polish and Catholic, and a veritable representative of the spirit of Old Russia.[1] The powers given to Mourawieff exceeded any given to any general in modern times, unless we except those accorded in 1861 to the generals of the Italian revolution, in the matter of repressing all Neapolitan devotion to the exiled and legitimate monarch of the Two Sicilies. Thus, we read:

"His Excellency will employ the most energetic measures against all whom he *supposes* to be favorable to the rebellion; he will take such measures as he may deem advisable against all *suspects*. His Excellency will use every means to instruct the peasants as to the czar's paternal intentions in their regard, and *he will represent to them that the land-owners are their enemies and oppressors*. If His Excellency deems it wise, he will furnish arms to such peasants as are attached to the czar and to Russia. *His Excellency will show the greatest possible severity toward the Catholic clergy, they being the instigators of the present rebellion*. He will cause a list of the suspected priests to be prepared, and he will proceed against these with the utmost energy. His Excellency will shoot immediately all rebel leaders who fall into his hands, and will take proper measures in regard to all other prisoners. When circumstances demand, His Excellency will proceed against families who may have relatives in the insurgent ranks. In fine, *His Excellency will adopt every means that he may deem conducive to immediate pacification*, His Majesty having deigned to confer full powers upon him."

Between June 8th and December 28th of 1863 Mourawieff either hung or shot eleven priests in Lithuania, while many scores of

[1] Mourawieff prided himself on being a freethinker. After the deportation of the Bishop of Wilna, the administrator of the diocese, Bowkiewicz, had occasion to confer with the general. The discussion was fruitless, and Mourawieff remarked: "You people are ever talking about God. Now, here I am seventy years old, and I have never seen such a person." The priest replied: "Probably Your Excellency will never see Him." (Regnault: *Mourawieff and the Archives of Czarism*, p. 37. Paris, 1863.) The party of Old Russia, of which Mourawieff was a good exponent, underwent a transformation after the emancipation of the serfs. Under the influence of Michael Katkoff, editor of the *Gazette of Moscow*, it became the party of Young Russia. What does Young Russia desire? The *Journal of Paris*, on March 27, 1868, thus answers the question: "A political organization like this: At the summit of the edifice an all-powerful czar, beneath him a hierarchy of functionaries, whose mission it would be to execute the orders of the emperor, and at the bottom an innumerable multitude, among whom there would reign equality, where the citizens would be all confused in a kind of communistic promiscuousness which Young Russia regards as democracy. All this obtained, the religion of Slavism would be pushed to fanaticism, and there would flourish a love of domination without limits and the blindest devotion to the will of the czar, the lord and father of all the Russians. This singular political system has recruited a considerable number of adherents; *it is pre-eminently the National Party*. There is to be no more influence from without; everything is to be for Russia and through Russia. To-day there still remain in the higher government circles traces of the olden German influence; all these must be made to disappear. Panslavism is a mission, and all who try to thwart it must be thrust aside; if they resist, they must be crushed. There are to be no more embarrassments; no such thing as Poland, with that phantom of independence which has hitherto been permitted to her. Panslavism is to know no obstacles, such as treaties and the respect due to them. . . . Russia represents the principle of nationalities (as advocated by Cavour); she is to deliver the Slavs of Russia and Turkey."

other priests were deported. In 1864 he closed twenty-four churches; in 1865, twenty-six; in 1867, one hundred and forty. Every Catholic land-owner and every Catholic ecclesiastic who had been allowed to remain in Lithuania was mulcted to the extent of more than a half of his revenues. In January, 1865, Mourawieff expelled all the female religious from Lithuania, not even excepting the Sisters of Charity. On September 14th Kauffmann, the successor of Mourawieff, presided at the inauguration, in Wilna, of an "Orthodox" church and two chapels which had been founded by his predecessor. On the following day the official *Courier of Wilna* published the sermon which signalized this triumph of the czarate.

"What do these monuments mean? They signify that not a stone will remain above another in all the cities of this land when Russia yields it to another. . . . On this occasion it is impossible not to glorify the late ruler of this region, the virtuous and wise Mourawieff, *who came among us like another Archangel Michael*, clothed in divine panoply, the cross on his breast, and beatitude on his forehead and lips, an olive-branch in one hand and a flaming sword in the other. . . . We see with joy this country throwing off the rags and dirt of its deplorable past as every part of it enters more determinedly into the living and potent organism of the Russian Empire. . . . A few more efforts, a few more enterprises, a little more time and patience, and on the brow of this country will be inscribed 'Holy and Orthodox Russia.'"

And a few days afterward Kauffmann thus addressed a deputation of the Lithuanian gentry:

"The severe regulations of the last few years will be maintained until I am convinced that you are thorough Russians, that you march in the way that is marked out for you by the law, and that you do so sincerely."

In plain language, Kauffmann signified the resolve of his government that the Catholics of Lithuania, like those of the other Polish provinces, and like those of the kingdom itself, were to deny their faith and their fatherland, unless they were ready for penury and deportation, and, in case of resistance, for the scaffold. When the marshal of the nobility, Krzywicki, at the head of a deputation of Lithuanian magnates, waited upon him in Wilna, the representative of the czar said:

"There is no pardon, even for those who have been condemned only to internment, *so long as Polonism and Catholicism are not totally extirpated, so long as there remains one Catholic church in the land. Reconciliation with the government and fidelity to the throne consist in the embrace of Orthodoxy by all, without exception.* Let the obstinate in their faith depart; for, gentlemen, I tell you again that no Catholic shall remain here, especially among the land-owners."

The determination here indicated was rendered manifest on January 8, 1866 (O. S., December 27, 1865), by the following imperial decree published in the *Gazette of the Senate:*

"Considering that in the nine governments of the West, the inhabitants of which are generally Little Russians and White Russians and partly Lithuanians and Samogitians, the population of Polish origin is comparatively small, and considering that this Polish population, composed generally of seignorial proprietors and of the middle class, impresses upon the country a Polish character—thus preventing the non-Polish inhabitants from progressing and profiting by the numerous reforms which His Imperial Majesty has granted to his other subjects—and considering that the strength of this class consists in the possession of property after the fashion of a close corporation, which admits none of any other nationality, especially none of the Russsan nationality, His Majesty, the Emperor, orders as follows: While awaiting a definitive organization of the governments in the West by a sufficient increase of Russian land-owners in those regions, no persons of Polish origin shall be allowed to acquire seignorial lands in the nine governments of the West. . . . Land-owners who have been exiled from the provinces of the West may, within the next two years, sell their estates in those provinces to persons of Russian origin *who profess either the Orthodox or Protestant religion.*"[1]

On December 27, 1866, Meyendorf, chargé d'affaires at the papal court, was received in audience by Pope Pius IX. The Pontiff protested against the persecutions in Poland and the western provinces of the empire. Especially he complained of the exile of Mgr. Felinski; of the imprisonment of that prelate's vicar, and of the vexations visited on the faithful Chapter of Warsaw.[2] The

[1] The Paris *Monde* of January 24, 1866, states that at that time in White Russia and in Lithuania there were 21,000 Catholic land-owners to 1600 who were either Orthodox or Protestants. In Volhynia and Podolia the proportion of Catholics was larger; in the sole district of Berditchef there were 244 Catholics to 4 Orthodox.

[2] Many times before this formal protest, Pius IX. had defended the cause of the Polish Catholics in the most solemn manner. We cite only the following passage from his Allocution in the Consistory of April 27, 1864: "The blood of the weak and the innocent cries to the throne of the Eternal for vengeance on those who have shed it. Poor Poland! I would have wished not to speak of this matter before the next Consistory; but I have feared that were I to keep silence any longer I would draw upon myself the punishment which the prophet announces as awaiting those who allow iniquity to be committed. No! I wish not to be compelled to cry, when I stand before the Eternal Judge, '*Vae mihi, quia tacui!*' I feel myself inspired to condemn that sovereign whose name I do not now pronounce because I shall mention it in another discourse, of that sovereign whose immense empire reaches to the pole. This potentate, who styles himself falsely an Eastern Catholic, but who is merely a schismatic cut off from the True Church, persecutes and kills his Catholic subjects, and by his cruelty he has forced them to insurrection. Under the pretext of repressing this insurrection he extirpates Catholicism, he deports entire populations to the regions of ice where they are deprived of all religious consolation, and he replaces them with schismatic adventurers. He tears priests from their flocks, and exiles them, condemning them to forced labor, and to other degrading punishments. Happy are those priests who have been able to flee, and are now wanderers in strange lands! This potentate, heterodox and schismatic though he is, arrogates to himself a power which even the Vicar of Jesus Christ does not possess. He pretends to depose a bishop whom we have canonically instituted. Insane man! He forgets that a Catholic bishop, whether on his throne or in the catacombs, is ever the same, and that his character is indelible. Let no man say that we foment European revolution when we raise our voice against these iniquities. We know how to distinguish between socialistic revolution and the struggle of a nation which fights for its independence and for its religious faith. In stigmatizing the persecutors of the Catholic religion, we fulfil

envoy had the audacity to contest the exactness of the Pope's information concerning events which were but too notorious; and when subterfuge failed him, he contended that the unfortunate Catholics would have suffered nothing, had they imitated the Protestants, and sided with the government of the czar during the insurrection. Finally, the foolish and impudent diplomat remarked that, after all, the Russian sovereign ought not to have been surprised at the revolt of the Catholics, since Catholicism and revolution are one and the same thing—"*giacchè il Cattolicismo vale lo stesso che la rivoluzione.*" It is possible that this outrage was premeditated, but whether it was designed at St. Petersburg or conceived in a muddy brain which knew nothing of diplomacy, the Pontiff could not ignore it. "You may go," he replied. "I must believe, Monsieur, that your emperor is not aware of all the miseries which cause Poland to groan. Therefore I respect your emperor, but I cannot say the same of his representative when he insults me in my own house, and when, in. my person, he insults all the faithful, of whom I am the head." The Russian government never disavowed this act of its agent, and diplomatic relations between it and the Holy See now ceased. It was at this time that Cardinal Antonelli published his official "Exposition, Accompanied by Documents, of the Continual Endeavors of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX., to Remedy the Sufferings of the Catholic Church in Russia and in Poland." Concluding the touching narrative, the secretary says: "The Holy Father had signed a Concordat, and he could never procure its execution. He has protested, but has received no satisfaction. Frequently he has raised his voice in public Consistories, but there has been no reduction of severity in the measures adopted. Finally he invoked directly the justice of the emperor, but in vain has he awaited a consoling reply. There remains for the Holy See, therefore, no other course for its justification than that of publishing the documents which will show how solicitous it has been in regard to this cherished portion of the flock of Jesus Christ. The picture presented is painful indeed; one needs only to glance at it in order to be convinced of the desolation to which the laws and acts of the imperial government have reduced the Church of Poland. We behold pastors snatched from their flocks, or

---

our sacred duty. We give our Apostolic benediction to all who pray for Poland to-day. Let us all pray for her!" Even the enemies of the Papacy admired this protest of "the old man of the Vatican." One of the foremost leaders of the Italian Unitarian movement, Brofferio, said in the Italian parliament on May 7th, "Behold an old man, tired, sick, without an army or any resources, and on the brink of the grave. He anathematizes a potentate who slaughters a people. I am agitated throughout my entire being. I fancy that I am living in the days of Gregory VII. I bow my head, and I applaud."

despoiled of their authority; the priests either proscribed or prevented from exercising their ecclesiastical ministry; the religious expelled and reduced to indigence; the Uniate Greeks drawn violently into schism: the Latins seduced or deprived of religious aid; sacred worship suspended, the churches being either desecrated or given over to non-Catholic services; the property of the Church stolen, the hierarchy abolished, religious and secular education contaminated, schism propagated; and, finally, every means destroyed whereby the Supreme Pastor might succor, teach, or console so large a number of his oppressed children." In an attempt to counteract the impression produced by this "Exposition," Prince Gortchakoff sent to each diplomatic agent of Russia in foreign countries a "Memorandum" which seems to have been designed to flatter the Muscovite arrogance rather than to convince Christendom, for it coolly contradicts the facts of history, and is often gratuitously insulting to the Sovereign Pontiff. In the next number of the REVIEW we shall show how the "gentle" Alexander II. extirpated by fraud and violence the United Greek Church in Poland; and then we shall unfold the panorama of Poland's religious martyrdom under Alexander III., and under the present czar, Nicholas II.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

PASSION-FLOWERS.

"With something of a lingering love, I read
The characters, by that mysterious hour
Stamped on the reverential soul of man
In visionary days, and thence thrown back
On the fair forms of nature. Many a sign
Of the great Sacrifice which won us Heaven,
The woodman and the mountaineer can trace
On rock, on herb, and flower. And be it so!
They do not wisely that with hurried hand
Would pluck these salutary fancies forth
From their strong soil within the peasant's breast,
And scatter them—far, far too fast! away
As worthless weeds: oh, little do we know
When they have soothed, when saved!"

—Felicia Hemans.

THE divinity that lies in nature has ever been present to men's minds the more simple their lives were and the purer their hearts. To every thinking person what we sum up in the word nature must always be at the same time supernatural; even its external aspects are so inscrutable and awe-inspiring, and its beauty so penetrating, that their contemplation makes the most flippant tongue silent in their presence, and often even reverent. It is not superior knowledge, but superior superficiality, that makes men see in the world around them nothing but "the outcome of known physical laws." It is true that law governs the universe, for "order is the first law of heaven," but to think that having arrived at this conclusion is the end of the whole matter shows how little we realize that this is the starting-point, not an end. Even to grasp what the universe means will always remain beyond our mental comprehension; when all material knowable facts shall have been gathered, we shall have but a sketch of a portion of the great picture, some of the pigments, in fact, which still need the hand and mind of the artist to make them intelligible and harmonious. This world of ours, with every element known and labelled in it, will still remain God's creation, "towards which," Mr. Carlyle says, "the best attitude for us after never so much science is awe, devout prostration and humility of soul, worship if not in words then in silence."

The earlier the record of human thought the more constantly evident is this reverence for the natural creation; Job as much as Homer is instinct with it. The most ancient oracle of Greece was that introduced by the Pelasgian settlers at Dodona, four thousand

years ago, and dedicated to Zeus, the omnipresent aether, and at that shrine the voice of the unseen divinity came to men in the rustling of the leaves of its oak trees, the song of its waters, and the melody of the birds in its groves; and in a like manner still, to many sensitively strung minds, the voices of the universe are like a Holy Spirit breathing upon the delicately attuned instrument of the soul, producing a harmony of sweet cadenced sounds that whisper of things too deep for words, but which need no priestess to interpret. We do not now deify the natural phenomena as they did in those old times; "we do not worship in that way now," Carlyle adds, "but is it not reckoned still a merit, a proof of what we call a 'poetic nature,' that we recognize how every object has a divine beauty in it; how every object still verily is a 'window through which we may look into infinitude itself?' He that can discern the loveliness of things we call him poet, painter, man of genius, gifted, lovable"; and whether it be pagan peasant of old or Christian king of the moyen âge, who learnt a sacred lesson from flower or bird or star, each in his own fashion, and to the extent of his own inner light of conscience, was poet and priest in one.

The Latin word for the culture of poetic life was identical with that for worship, and the term is taken from rural occupation, for men could not conceive of culture being possible without reverence, nor anything so conducive to reverence as a communing with nature. The early Teutonic races had so profound a sense of the sacredness of the very soil that we get our word earth from the goddess Hertha, with whom they identified it. These ancient Pantheisms were at least religions of the heart if not of the mind, and brought men face to face with divinity from dawn to sunset, and every mountain and river, every grove and meadow had its deity; Christianity united head and heart in regarding all nature as deriving its life from the same source as that of man himself, sharing in varying degrees in the Fall, "groaning and travailing" in pain, together with him awaiting the Redemption, since he was its perfection and head; he its complete expression uniting it to the divine; he its priest, the voice by which was offered the Benedicite to the Creator from every created phase of life.

In every form of faith that has ever possessed any living influence upon men's minds we may find abundant examples of how human nature has especially turned to trees and flowers to assist in the expression of the deepest emotions of which it was capable. Christianity is no exception, but strangely enough this is quite unknown, and is only met with in the half-a-dozen or so of instances adduced by its enemies to impress their readers with the

belief that the followers of Christ did but change pagan names into Christian ones, so lacking were they in imagination or in spontaneous devotion! The writer of this paper has devoted many years of study to this particular subject, and it would surprise anyone to learn how vast and beautiful the Christian flora really is. The lives of Our Lord and His Blessed Mother are found to be recalled in almost every known event and almost every simile or type. We might plant our gardens with trees, shrubs and herbs which would speak to us, as they did to our pious forefathers throughout mediæval Christendom, of Our Lord's Nativity, Circumcision, Murder of the Innocents, Flight into Egypt and Repose there, Lent and all its commemorations, Holy Week and the Passion, Easter, the Ascension, and even further in His Life still in the Blessed Sacrament and the Church. So large is this flora that it makes a volume of itself, full of the most lovely and tender teaching, and radiant with faith and poetic beauty. The flora of Mary is quite as extensive, and in this every type and symbol, every detail of her life in connection with her share in the work of man's redemption, memorials of the holy life at Nazareth, and much else can be found recalled, so as to form a life of Our Lady among the flowers. The Flora of the Saints is a third division, and as may be imagined, as large as the two mentioned. This delightful store has been lying scattered throughout Christened peoples, attracting only a casual notice when an individual example came prominently before the public, but existing for centuries often in the folk-lore of quiet countries or districts. No one before the present writer has attempted to collect it, no writer upon the flora sacra has made a systematic study of it, apparently; but in volume after volume appearing upon the folk-lore of flowers, when the writers come to this part of their subject, they either resort to fancy or copy others without investigating their credibility. The source of the usually reputed floral dedications to the saints was a list produced in Howe's "Every-Day Book" in 1826; they bore no author's name, but were afterwards proved to be by a Dr. Forster, who reproduced them in his own "Circle of the Seasons" in 1828, supporting them by quaintly spelt and turned rhymes, etc., the whole of which he subsequently confessed to have been his own invention. The evil had been done, and countless enlargements of his saints' flowers have been made and circulated in England, America, Italy and elsewhere. We will not pursue this further, but this warning is needful, and the assurance is given that in this extensive sacred flora existing to which we have referred as having ourselves collected, no name is found mentioned save such as have botanical words or acknowledged folk-lore authorities for their existence even to this day.

To those artists who consecrate their talents to ecclesiastical work some such collection has been sorely missed, for nothing can be more sterile than the resources for floral symbolic work in modern church art. Beyond the vine, wheat, rose, lily and passion-flower they have no variety in the detail of their sculpture, painting or embroidery, and yet among flowers and birds there is a great store of material offering its aid, symbolic as all religious art should be, full of teaching to its minutest point, and bringing with it a wealth of instruction, delight, as well as human interest, into their design. Why should we be subject to this famishment in a land of plenty when a little stirring and pruning in the vine-yard of the traditions of Holy Church will produce such nourish-able fruit? What an interest it would arouse if the foliage about this altar and around that sanctuary told of the dolour of the Cross; if some of the many blossoms in Mary's large garden were so found adorning her chapel. If wreaths composed of the Baptizer's flora were to be seen on the walls about the font, would not our churches once again "smell of myrrh, aloes and cassia" in the sweet fragrance of their instruction and inspiration? The lifeless-ness of good modern ecclesiastical work is probably more in its lack of poetry and imagination than anything else. The thought of the day is patently drawing closer to mediæval ideas, and the principles of its life and the preciousness and consistency of its faith is daily more recognized. The Christian flora was the crea-tion of the vivid belief of those times, and has existed ever since, spreading in a language that no tyrant could silence, and with a potency that indifference and callousness alone can render help-less. The deeper religious life becomes, the more it will resort to symbolism, and the deeper the affection of an artist for nature the more sincere will become his work and the more he will seek to express his affection in illustrations gathered in her realm.

The field of nature is so wide that the student may have reason-ably contended that he was unable to select one plant more than another as consecrated to Christian uses and subjects. There are, however, such to be found illustrative of every doctrine of the faith, and the interpretation is that of many generations of Chris-tened souls whose eyes now gaze on the flowers of heaven, and their dedication, like the canonization of many a saint in the calendar, by popular acclaim and recognition.

Again, there is no excuse for a modern artist to confine him-self to the narrow information of a mediæval one upon natural objects, knowledge then was so local, comparatively; but in these days, when the means of inter-communication have made conti-nents like to countries then, and when there is little that has been thought, or is thought, in one place that is not easily learnt in all

others, there is no reason why the symbolic teaching in nature of any Christian land should not be used and known in all others. Moreover, there can be no question as to its being incumbent upon those who are desirous of making the spirit of the art of mediæval time the principle of modern work, that they should show the mark of their time not only in adapting that art to modern requirements, but also in employing, for decoration, subjects which satisfy and feed the mental demand created by the popular extension of education among all classes, and which the accumulation of literature from every country at our doors renders accessible to all students. Church art will then once again become vital and contemporaneous when it gives voice to the thought of the day and the nobler tastes of its children, not producing copies of by-gone ages. The principles of mediæval work are eternally true, but their application varies with the varying generations of human life. In the greater use of natural detail we shall but reproduce the universal taste of this present time in its keen appreciation of floral and animal life, and for the ecclesiastical designer there is a sacred fauna no less than a sacred botany from which to draw his illustrations. In his power it lies to elevate these tastes of his time, as it is seemly all the work of the sanctuary should tend to do; every detail employed will not only attract the superficial observer, but to the thoughtful it will be a voice uniting in the chorus of meaning which it will have been the artist's effort to evoke. To all true artists there must be the ardent love of natural life in every form, so that, like the Countess Matilda on the banks of the Lethe, he finds in the Psalmist's words his expression of the joy of his heart in earth's meadow sweet fields—"Quia delectasti me, Domine, in factura tua, et in operibus manuum tuarum exultabo."

If ecclesiastical artists should exclusively use the flora that has been connected in the Church with sacred associations, to how much wider a circle should that flora be known when we think of those who care for gardening as a recreation? Every finer nature is appreciative of trees and flowers, in man no less than woman. We can scarcely picture in our minds the idea of a home without flowers, and the home is woman's empire; flowers should ever surround her throne, and the most fitting setting that our thought can give a noble woman is perhaps in a garden or among the flowers, to which her grace and beauty are so constantly compared. This is a purely Christian ideal, not Greek or Roman, far less Buddhist or Mahommedan. It is a feeling now so engrained in our nature that we are apt to forget its divine origin; for God made woman of finer material than man, not of the dust of the earth, but of vitalized flesh, and her birthplace was within the

Garden of Delights itself; she was not brought there like Adam; Adam's work was to tend a garden, Eve's probably to utilize it. The Creator's plan for man's existence on this earth was not to dig for gold or play with its counters, but to be occupied mentally and physically as a gardener, and hence all ecclesiastical labor in more sincere and faithful days was agricultural—this the ancient Cistercian order still represents; and it was perhaps not without purposeful intent that the Marys at the sepulchre of the Second Adam were to mistake the risen Saviour in the character of the First.

The purer the taste for floral nature and the less vitiated it is by indulgence in only seeking to satisfy the sensuous luxury of the eye, the keener will be the appreciation and the clearer the perception of its sacredness. The humblest weed will become awe-inspiring in its marvellous evidence of the wisdom and beauty of its Maker's mind; and if these exquisite artistic specimens of the divine Craftsman be united with some person or event in sacred story, then there is added an historical interest which would prove a less abstract and esoteric attraction. All nature supplies examples of the first, but only the Christian flora of both combined; and we cannot but think that there exist a very large number of people to whom the flora sacra would be a new and healthy delight, and that they would desire to rear and develop to its greatest extent of beauty every plant that finds a place therein. Why should we not have our saints' gardens in which every tree, shrub and flower was one which generations of pious folk have christened and loved? Think what a fresh interest and what healthy thoughts would be inspired by a garden whose herbs were those of sacred association to you as they were to our forefathers. If you could see in the floramour, with its purple tail-like blossom, the blood-stained "Scourge of Our Blessed Lord," as it is still known in many lands, or "The Discipline of the Religious," as it is known in others, would not these titles give a deeper significance and the true meaning to the English name for the same of "Love-lies-a-bleeding" more touchingly beautiful than ever we dreamt of before? If the fuchsia with its gouts of pendant scarlet were to our eyes, as they were to men of old, the "Blood-drops of the Redeemer"; the monstrance-like flower of the scarlet lychnis, the "Flower of the Blessed Sacrament"; the sundew or drosera, "Gideon's Fleece," the type of the Immaculate Birth of Mary's Son; or the "Burning Bush" of holly another type of her constant virginity, would not your garden breathe a sweeter fragrance, and its blossoms sing a holier song with such associations as these? Would it not become indeed an Eden of Delights for the mind and soul of man to wander about, and a holy place for

your children? And remember, this is no fancy, it is not the poetry of an individual's private thought; these are the titles and associations left us by our Catholic ancestors, common often to all Christened Europe, and still in these super-excellent times to be heard where faith, piety and peaceful homes are found.

So, too, in our domestic use of greenery, what an intellectual charm it adds to the pleasure of its presence, if there be a reason in its use. In old time every season had its own flora appropriate to it; Christmas and Easter, Pentecost and the Assumption all had their own boughs and flowers. We can still trace signs of this in modern days in every country, especially at the Nativity. Yet even here we have lost the use and meaning of the rosemary boughs which once were always present, full of pious memories, and the Christmas roses that the Shepherd Maid offered at the crib, of the cradle grasses that formed the bed of the little Saviour, and very many others. Why do we never see St. John's worts or any of his large flora about our homes at midsummer; Michaelmas-daisies at Michaels-tyde; Stars of Bethlehem for the Epiphany; and the like? And, as we write this last, we do not only mean the pretty holly stars which are placed in the windows of many a noble mansion in New York, and which is an entirely beautiful memorial, but the flowers themselves, whether the *Ornithogalum*, originally brought to Europe by the crusading knights who found it abundant about the Manger City, or the flaming *Poinsettia* which forms so striking an emblem. There is no reason why we should not make our gardens a very calendar of the seasons and of the saints of Holy Church if we wished, and not only our homes and our families, but our churches would gain in the perfume of pious thought thus engendered. What depth of reality there would be if even the flowers used upon our altars or at our festivals, ecclesiastical or domestic, were those of these dedicated blossoms, thus consecrated to sacred uses, as everything employed in the service of the Church should be; if Mary's many buds alone were seen at her shrines, or those of the Passion and the Blessed Sacrament about the tabernacle; if those wedding-bouquets now composed of unmeaning exotics, nurtured and pampered and typical only of the luxurious wantonness of the world, bore some flowers that told that "Jesus was there and His Mother," as at far-off Cana in Galilee; or a sprig of the "Seven-years Love" were seen, to recall the perfect love of Jacob for Rachel.

There were once, it would appear, *Gardina Sacristæ*, or Church Gardens, as late Latin called them, for we find instances mentioned of one or two. For example, adjoining the Lady Chapel at Winchester there was one which long after the destruction of the

sacristy was known as the Paradise; and again, in the will of King Henry VI. he left directions concerning a garden for the chapel of Eton College, "which is left for to sett in certain trees and flowers, behovable and convenient for the service of the same Church" (Nichols's "Wills of the Kings and Queens of England"). About Hamburg and other parts of Germany the peasants who possessed a garden never entered a church without a posy gathered from a corner reserved for the purpose, and in France they called such little beds "Les bouquets de l' Église." In England of even thirty years ago the same spirit was seen among our own country folk, who bore to church small nosegays, which in earlier times would have been laid at the feet of Our Lady of Pity or some such favorite shrine; and much else might be said of these practices.

Perhaps once again these Church Gardens may be found in our homes, and as certainly as they are tended with mind and heart they will be found to be the creators of an entirely different and higher delight in nature than any we have hitherto enjoyed, and the petition "Come, south wind, and blow through my garden and let its aromatic spices flow forth," will be a petition for graces and virtues which the lessons learnt therein have inspired and fostered.

We have said that we could follow most of the events in the life of Our Blessed Lord in the associations that have been united to certain trees and herbs, and we should naturally expect to find that the Passion occupied the most prominent position, not only for its importance, but also because some of its chief emblems and instruments belong to this department of nature. The Olives of Gethsemani, the Tree of Judas, the Crown of Thorns, the Reed in the Hand, the Tree of the Cross, all belong to it specifically; but besides these, pious eyes loved to trace other memorials of each event in the Holy Week, and that with such elaboration that it proved how deeply they had meditated upon them. No doubt the Passion-plays encouraged this close contemplation, for it is scarcely otherwise possible that the entire community should have been so intimately familiar with the lesser detail as they were. Let us in outline trace this flora of Lent and Passion-tyde, and we can only do so briefly, as space would not permit of our dealing with it in full, and the record of the trees, shrubs and plants connected with the cross, crown of thorns and Judas would alone occupy double the length of our present paper.

With Lent we enter upon this domain of sorrow, and scarcely have the candlemas bells (snowdrops) ceased before the Lent lilies (*Narcissus pseudo-narcissus*) appear and "fill their cups with tears." Their name is peculiar apparently to England, for other

lands know them by titles referring to certain saints' days occurring early in the year; some of their local applications tell of the season, such as "gracy days," another term for Lent as being a time of especial grace; "Butter-and-Eggs," prompted by the creamy white petals and orange nectary of some varieties, which recalled the "Butter-and-Eggs" so constantly occurring among the foods mentioned in the Lenten Indult; "Lent Cocks" tells, alas! of a cruel sport once popular at Shrove-tyde of throwing sticks at cocks, for which these pretty flowers provided a child's substitute. In Portugal the Ranunculi—buttercups, crowfoots and celandines—are the Lent flowers; the various *Primulas*, viz., oxlips, cowslips and primroses in Germany; but all these are no further allied to the season than by their time of flowering, and so scarcely need be mentioned. Mid-Lent Sunday, also known as Jerusalem or Rose Sunday, and in England as Mothering Sunday, had a variety of pretty customs and names originating in the Epistle and Gospel of the day. It took its name, Rose Sunday, from the custom of the Holy Father blessing a golden flower upon this day, subsequently sent to some sovereign or shrine; and it is not improbable that this is recalled in the name Jerusalem Rose found given in Switzerland to the Poetic Narcissus (*Narcissus poeticus*), whose exquisite flower then comes into blossom, and whose form is not unlike the early specimens of the Pope's gift. *Himmels mehl* or Heaven's Dust, given in Austria to the glossy golden flowered lesser celandine (*Ranunculus ficaria*), would also seem to have been suggested by its coming at this time to recall the golden streets of the heavenly city, "Jerusalem on high," the "mother of us all." "To go a-mothering and find violets in the hedge" was an old saying indicative of the custom of the lads and lassies to gather at their homes upon Mi-Carême and look for the violets—the *Viola quadragesimalis* of the old botanists—and mark where they were to be found ready to strew the Easter sepulchre a fortnight hence. The name of the day led men to unite together in thought not only their earthly parent and mother Church, but also their heavenly Mother of the Church of the Blessed, and so in this season of that Mother's dolour they sought out the flower from which she took the title of *Viola inviolata*, and called it the Violet of the Mother of God, as they do still in Spain, the Balearic Isles, and such old world spots. Palm-Sunday comes next, with its memories connected with other trees besides that from which it takes its name, and to which that term has thus become transferred, so that we have yew, olive, willow, box, and even hazel spoken of as palm; and finally we enter the Garden of Olives itself, where the memorials among the trees and herbs thicken closely around us

and continue to do so until the last sad scene of the Passion is concluded.

We could dwell a long time upon the absorbing interests that to every Christian man must gather at the Garden of Gethsemani, or of the Olive-Press, for of all the spots in the Holy Land most sought for and most appreciated, none is equal to the hillside of Olivet; we must only linger to mark its eventful connection with the flowers. In Cheshire they call the spotted orchis (*Orchis mascula*, etc.) and cuckoo-pint (*Arum maculatum*) by the name of "Gethsemani," for both appear at the spring-time with their fair green leaves stained with dark blotches, as though upon them, amid the herbage beneath the praying Saviour, had fallen the Sweat of Blood that betrayed the Agony of His Soul. In Spain the same association is found, for they call them "Sangre de Cristo," while these plants have so many other connecting memorials with this portion of Our Lord's life that they might be termed the "English Passion-flower." The pretty veronica flower (*Veronica officinalis*) has the name still in parts of Germany of *Schweitz Christ*, or Christ's Sweat, but it is more probably in reference to a later scene in the Via Crucis, when the good woman stepped out of the crowd to wipe the perspiring brow of the divine prisoner and received the stain upon her veil.

We pass by the many herbs that refer to the Jews, their staves and lanterns, the cutting off the ear of Malchus, and follow Our Blessed Lord across the Kedron to the house of Caiaphas, now the Armenian monastery on the slope of Zion, where the tombs of the patriarchs of that communion are gathered. It was here that there took place many of the most repulsive indignities offered to the sacred victim, the blindfolding, buffeting, spitting, and finally the denial of Peter. It is frequent in art to find the blindfolding of Our Lord represented in a wonderfully thoughtful manner, for through the band across the face the all-seeing eyes of God penetrate. Many a flower bears the name of Christ's Eyes, but none seem to recall this particular scene so remarkably and beautifully as the *Nigella damascena* and its varieties, for its exquisite blue flower is one shed over with a sagene of delicate fibrils, dimming, as it were, the lovely blossom and veiling its rare purity from the rude gaze. In every land they are called flowers of the Passion and Christ's Eyes, and in England we have for them besides these the poetic title of "Love-in-a-mist," a similar tender expression of the piety of our forefathers to that which suggested to them "Love-lies-a-bleeding" for the scourge stained with blood of the amaranthus flower. The buffeting and insult to the beard and face is reverently suggested in the separated bunches of the flower-head of certain plants whose tufted form recalled the cruelty

of those who "plucked out the hair." In Germany we find the blue *Phyteuma spicatum* or rampion known as Unsers lieben Herr Gotts Bartchen, or Our Dear Lord's Little Beard; in the same land they found like similes in their Herr Gotts bartlein or *Polygala vulgaris*, *Sanguisorba*, *Epilobium* and *Spiræa*, or as more commonly known, the milkwort, burvet, willow-herb and meadow-sweet. The denial by St. Peter, as illustrated by his tears of penitence, is frequently to be found memorialized in the large flora that bears his name. In Spain especially "St. Peter's Tears" is a not uncommon dedication, and from that land it has spread to its colonies. The slender and elegant grass with gently drooping head, known as the Trembling Grass and Peter's Corn (*Buza media*), in Spain is Lagrimas de San Pedro, and similarly they name the graceful bushy *Fuchsia coccinia*, from the axils of whose crimson-veined leaves is produced their ensanguined flower. The same people like to think of the apostle's tears of penitence springing up into those white flowers of absolution, the *Ornithogalum* or Bethlehem Stars which abound around that city and the Judæan hills; and perhaps it was this idea of the tears of earnest contrition blossoming into flowers that led the Welsh to name the Lent lily (*Narcissus pseudo-narcissus*) St. Peter's Leek, although we are aware that other explanations are as probable. In the Spanish West Indies we find the title St. Peter's Tears borne by the *Anthacanthus microphyllus*, and in Venezuela by the *Rasselia juncea.* A small chapel used to stand in the twelfth century upon the spot where the penitent Apostle is thought to have thrown himself down in the agony of his grief, and it bore the name of his tears, or sometimes of St. Peter in Gallicante. It is not improbable that many of those plants which bore in early time the name of cock's-comb were originally connected with this scene in the Passion, and although we have not hitherto found this to be so, still it is possible others may. The cow-wheat (*Melampyrum*), known as Peter's blume in Germany and Holland, has a crested species, with little brush-like heads that may have been likened to the cock's-comb, and the pretty plant known by that name (*Rhinanthus cristagalli*) is very suggestive of the same, but we have no authority for connecting it with St. Peter.

At the end of the examination before Caiaphas our Blessed Lord's hands were bound, and He was led away to Pilate, the Roman governor of the city. The hands that had only been employed in doing good we may see commemorated in many an herb and usually connected with the virtue of their touch. The marsh-cleaver (*Menyanthes*), one of the most elegant of our aquatic plants, was one of these, of the gentian family, a trefoil, and bearing the white flower of innocence. Its bitterness recalled the bitterness

of the cross, and so in Silesia they name it kreuz wurz; but its tonic properties, acting as a febrifuge and palliative in cases of dropsy, ague, gout, and the liver, made northern peoples regard it as typical of the touch of the Great Physician, and so it became also our Lord's Hand. The name Palma Christi was borne by several simples in ancient leechcraft, especially in later times by the *Ricinus*, or castor-oil tree, whose palmate leaf and the precious qualities of its fruit are still valued in the modern pharmacopœia. Those hands, too, the wells of mercy and grace, were connected with the curative efficacy of the common milfoil or yarrow (*Achillea*), and in Austria they know it as Gotteshand; the aromatic orchis (*Habenaria conopsea*) is Herrgottshändgen or die Jesushand in Germany, names also applied, as we shall see, to many of the divided tubers of the orchid family in that land, as well as in France, Norway, Sweden, etc. "The Finger of God," so mighty and venerable an eastern emblem of Omnipotence, which, with our Lord on earth, was miraculous in its touch to cure soul and body, and by which He Himself says that He "cast out devils," was united in emblem to the sweet honeysuckle (*Lonicera*). Pluck one of the petals of the curious flower-head, and place the bottom of the tube in your mouth, and see if it suggest to you the connection between the Finger of God and the miracle of the dumb man when it "touched his tongue" and he spake plain. It grows everywhere in Palestine as commonly as in our own hedge-rows. *Lilium inter spinas* was its old botanical name, and in the north of England they call it Our Lady's Fingers; and thus we find Mother and Son united together in the same flower, as occurs so beautifully and touchingly true in a large number of memorials in nature. There is some confusion and mingling of the spotted arum and spotted orchis, and the four names of one are frequently given to the other. The former is called in Gloucestershire and elsewhere (Our) Lady's Finger, and the latter is still in Denmark Vor Herres Fingre; and the English name for the arum of "Lords and Ladies," a probably modern form of Our Lord and Our Lady, seems repeated in the Scandinavian and German names for the latter of Christ or God and Our Lady's Hand. The arum has a fleshy spike enclosed in a large sheathing-leaf like a protecting mantle around and about it, called by botanists the spathe, and this spike might very well be called the finger. Some have thought that its name Lords and Ladies was in memory of the figures of Our Lord and His Holy Mother within the niched recesses and beneath canopies with which all Catholics were familiar; but more probably it was of Mary's Mantle—as they know the plant in France—shielding her Divine Son beneath its fold. This is the herb which might be called the northern passion-flower, for others

have seen in this spike the emblem of the pillar, in its roots the scourge, and in the dark stains of its leaves the blood-drops, and in the shape of those leaves the cruel lance-head; while in Cheshire it is called Gethsemani, and in parts of Germany St. Veronica's wort. The spotted orchis has a spike of flesh-colored flowers, and, together with several other of its species, has leaves spotted with scattered purple blotches, and all have very sacred memories in all northern lands. Their names range from our Lord's Finger and the marks of His tears to Our Lord's Flesh and Blood, whence is obtained its Breton title of Bleûm or Sakramant, or Flower of the Blessed Sacrament. They are also known in every land as Palma Christi, and this from the peculiarity of the root, which is like two separate roughly-cut hands, and, singularly enough, one is white and the other black. This peculiarity was seized upon by the pious minds of old to convey a holy lesson, and one is named Our Lord's Hand or the Blessed Virgin's, and the other that of the Devil. If they be cast into water, it is found that the dark one sinks to the bottom, while the white one remains on the surface, and these homely illustrations would be shown to his children by the Christian peasant as he told of the victory of the Saviour over the powers of hell or how Mary cannot consort with evil.

The hands of our Blessed Lord being bound with a rope has not been unnoticed, and the hemp agrimony (*Eupatorium cannabinum*), with its hemp-like leaves and pink flowers, is called in England The Holy Rope; the wild hemp-nettle (*Galeopsis tetrahit*) has the same title. "The bark of some species of the nettle family affords an invaluable fibre, especially that of the hemp plant (*Cannabis sativa*), which has been cultivated from a remote period in temperate climates for its fibre. It is recorded as having been under culture 2500 years ago. The fibre is obtained in the same way as flax." So closely did men once contemplate each detail of the Passion that they remembered that the Divine Prisoner would be led with His hands of mercy in fetters, and that fetter would be a rope. Then they considered what plant in nature was so used, so that whenever they saw it on their path they might recall the use to which its fibres were once adapted. In Italy they call the hemp-nettle Erba Judaica or Erbe dell' Invidia, as if referring to the words of the Evangelist concerning Pilate—to whom the Saviour was now being led—that "he knew that for envy they (the Jews) had delivered Him."

While the sinless One goes to Pilate the arch-traitor goes to "his own place." The large number of trees and plants telling of the Bag or Bourse of Judas, the money paid him, the tree of his doom, and other points in connection with him we must pass over

and follow the crowd to the other side of the Holy City, where was the residence of the military governor. Bordering upon the north side of the temple enclosure, still clearly marked out as the most satisfying site in the whole city, and occupied by the mosque of Omar and its spacious courts, is the Turkish barrack, covering what was the Tower of Antonia, erected by Herod, the slayer of Holy Innocents. The Romans occupied it, as the Turks do now, as their garrison head-quarters and the residence of the governor. Here was the Prætor's Hall, or Prætorium, with its paved court, known to the Hebrews as the Gabbatha, or, in the prevailing language, Lithostratos. It is approached now by a gently-ascending plane, for the steps that were there have been removed to Rome by St. Helena—from their having been trod by the Man of Sorrows—and are preserved, as the Scala Sancta, near the Church of St. John Lateran. The early Christians covered the court with little shrines marking the traditional spots where their Redeemer had endured the scourging, the mock-crowning, and finally the condemnation to the cross. Up and down the Scala Sancta Our Blessed Lord must have gone four times, for it has been said that the making "April fools" of persons by sending them upon bootless errands took its origin as a memorial of the manner in which He was sent hither and thither—from Annas to Caiaphas, from Caiaphas to Pilate, from Pilate to Herod, from Herod to Pilate again, and from Pilate to the cross, and it is not improbable that such thought supplanted some earlier spring custom. Having, therefore, left the house of Caiaphas, where He had been blasphemed, and the house of Herod, where He had been treated as a fool, Jesus is dragged before Pilate; and here, after examination, He is bound to a pillar and scourged. "Dominus voluit conterere eum in infirmitate."

The spike of the orchis and its fibrous roots have been seen to recall the pillar and the bands that bound the divine Sufferer, just as the pistil and tendrils in the passiflora have had similar associations, but of the scourge there are more striking memorials in nature. The very pretty and interesting dwarf birch (*Betula nana*) has still in Scandinavia and its surroundings the name of Lang predagsbjörk or buske, and of it is told the legend that it was once a noble and full-sized tree, but grief at the purpose for which it was once used has rendered it thus dwarfed and humbled. The same connection has been assigned to the drooping willow (*Salix Babylonica*) which comes from the Levant, Christian legend saying that it too wept at the indignity offered to the Creator of all things, and thereafter all its species have drooped their branches in grief and shame and been called weeping-willows. Among the herbs we also find several that recalled to pious eyes the "Disciplina

pacis nostræ," as Isaias refers to this punishment, and none more appropriately and arrestively than the floramour or flower gentle (*Amaranthus candatus*), whose very name seems to tell of the gentle Lover of Souls, if we would think of it so. Its pendant racemes, stained a purple-red, have, however, very definite titles dedicating this memorial to the "Discipline of our Peace," although not now often heard mentioned, though the plant is familiar in every old garden, and few emblems can be more striking. In Sicily it is still "The Scourge of Our Blessed Lord," and in France and Northern Italy "The Discipline of Religious," while our English name for it of "Love-lies-a-bleeding" is no doubt the tender expression of the same. We have already spoken of a similar title in connection with the *Nigella*, known in England alone as "Love-in-a-Mist," and in other countries as Christ's Eyes, referring to the blindfolding or to the mist of death gathering upon the dying Saviour's eyes as they gazed from the cross in love and forgiveness, and these are very remarkable instances of the poetry of language and of thought which once pervaded Mary's dowerland.

The cruel thistle with yellow flower of Southern Europe (*Carlina corymbosa*) is God's Scourge or Fouito-Dieu in Provence; the purple Picnomon or Carlina acarna, a species (*diacanthum*) of which is found in Syria, is the Asota Christos or Christ's Scourge of Spain; the yellow *Kentrophyllum canatus*, etc., which gets its name from its sharp-pointed leaves, is the Azota Cristos of Aragon, while its red juice has prompted the name in Granada of Sangre de Cristo, and in the dialect of Southern France it is Le Trounc de Nostre Segné. So, too, the form of the various species of *Naias* readily prompted their old name of Flagellum Christi, and in France and Germany they retain that title. In the feathery topped meadow-grass (*Poa pratensis*) with its purple-hued panicles French children saw Le fouet de Jesus, while in the same land some species of lettuce (*Lactuca*) are known as La plagellée and La laitua de la Passion, either from the rugged shape of their leaves or from appearing about that season.

Such associations are of interest to old and young who possess any intellectual vitality, but to simple hearts and pious minds they must be more than this.

> "Si virga pœnitentiæ
> Cordis rigorem conterat."

We must pass over the large flora connected with the Crown of Thorns, one of those culminating events concentrating in itself the mockery and cruelty of the Passion upon which art has lavished its devotion, and content ourselves with one more scene in the

Hall of Pilate. We are told the soldiers placed a reed in the Saviour's hand as a mock sceptre—"arundinem in dexteram Ejus," and some have thought that this, like the *Calamus* mentioned with the giving of the vinegar and gall, was not an actual reed, but that the word was used for the light shafts of the lances such as Bedouin Arabs bear to this day. This, too, would make the striking across the face with it subsequently an even more brutal and violent assault than we usually imagine, and certainly be the more probable instrument to have been used subsequently to raise the death-potion to the divine Redeemer's lips upon the tree. It has, however, been customary to take the immediate meaning of the word and represent this sceptre as a reed, and the early Italian painters, and Rubens for instance, usually depict the *Typha latifolia* or *angustifolia*, which we name in England from this use of it, the Reed-Mace, and in France Le Roseau or Le Jonc de la Passion.

Our Saviour having been condemned is led forth along the Via Crucis to Calvary bearing His cross, and Christian piety has made the trees and flowers of earth to rise up responsive to the tread of its Creator, and speak to the wayfarer in as potent a manner as did the pictures of that sad procession in their churches. We can but here indicate some of these, for they are too extensive for more than their mention; the tree of the cross and the memorials of it would take as many pages as this paper does itself. The meeting of the Mother and Son—the IV. Station—a scene so painful that the mind shrinks from making the complete picture even in contemplation, the sensitiveness of the human heart being too acute to permit. The tears of Jesus and Mary! what a thought and what a relief to turn to their many memorials among the sympathizing flowers. The gentle office of St. Veronica—the VI. Station—and many other scenes that speak to us from the waysides must be here omitted, and we stand on Calvary's rock, the great God-Man being nailed to His couch of pain. The nails always amongst the emblems of the Passion, are commemorated in our bede-sedge (*Sparganium ramosum*), which was so named by our forefathers from its studs of inflorescence recalling the heads of the cruel nails, and serving the peasant in the fields as a Rosary whereon to mark his bedes or prayers. In France they are called Les cloux de Dieu, and both this species and other bur-reeds are equally remindful and appropriately named. A species of *Senecio* or groundsel, many of which are large shrubs, has in the Eifel district of the Rhineland the name of Herr Gottsnagel, a title found elsewhere for some of the *Sedums* or stone-crops. Most of the geranium family have a beak-like prolongation of the carpel points sometimes growing out to the length of two or three inches

after the plant has ceased to flourish, and giving them their popular name of cranesbills. These readily suggested a sacred simile, and hence they are still known in Sardinia, Provence, and other southern districts of Europe, as the Nails of Our Lord, or as the pretty language of the South of France expresses it, "Claveu dou Son Dieu"; in Italy they seem to think of the frightful anguish they must have caused the poor Mother's heart, and name them "Anzas de nostra Signora."

In mediæval leechcraft, when the doctrine of signatures prevailed, many a plant that bore a resemblance to the lance-head that pierced the Saviour's side was deemed useful to the simpler in making his compounds for the cure of wounds or the cutting of phlegm, hence Lancea Christi became a generic term in their pharmacy, the same as Oculus Christi and Palma Christi did for other purposes in their herbal remedies. Some of these remain with us in use, their virtue being of proved value, such as the precious pectoral commonly known as horehound, whose various species are known botanically as black horehound (*Ballota nigra*), white horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), and water horehound (*Lycopus Europæus*). They are all lubiates of sage-like leaves, those of the last named species being deeply serrated or jagged, and vividly resembling a cruel barbed spear-head. In France and Germany it is still known as Le lance de Christ or Christus lanze, while the whorl of white flowers at its axils seemed like the memory of the "Water and Blood" which the wound in the side set free. Another of these memorials is found in the adder's tongue fern (*Ophioglossum vulgatum*), whose leaf has the shape of an ordinary broad lance-head, and whose spike is like the termination of the rattlesnake. This is also a Lancea Christi of the early botanists, and continues to be known as Lance de Christ or Lanço dou Christ in Northern and Southern France, and Speer-Kruid or Christi Lancet in the Netherlands. It is also called from its many utilities the "Herb of a Hundred Miracles," for it was prized for the very wounds that spears could make, and a preparation known as the "Green Oil of Charity" made from it is still to be met with. Gerarde declares of this fern that boiled in olive oil it produces a "most excellent green oyle or rather balsam for greene wounds comparable to oyle of St. John's wort, if it does not surpasse it," and this latter was known as the "Balsam of Warriors' Wounds." We may take this plant therefore as containing in itself, in virtue and shape and symbolism, a very striking lesson to earnest eyes; for the words of the Psalmist, "The poison of asps is under their tongues, their words are very swords," is applied by the Church to the wounds of Our Lord in the house of His friends, and when illustrated by the adder's tongue, Lancea Christi, and its return-

ing the oil of charity for the very injuries the spear could make, it is a vivid lesson from the flowers upon the "Blood with Man's forgiveness warm." The same simile was seen in the docks or sorrels, several of which, especially the *Rumex acetosa* and *acetosella*, have barbed leaves like spear- or arrow-heads, and whose crimson spire of flower, and in some species red-veined leafage, all combined to make them bear such names as the Passion's dock, or as the above-named are known in the Balearic Isles, Sang de Jesu Christ. Their family is said to get its name from the habit of the Romans of chewing these leaves to quench the thirst, and this tribute of nature seems to rise up in response to the cry of "Sitio" from the cross. The *R. acetosa* contains pure oxalic acid, and is common with the *acetosella* and others in every British meadow and wild corner of our fields, containing within itself a sermon more beautiful than most of the rare exotics in the greenhouse, and telling of the stream from the Saviour's side released by the soldier's spear, of which Our Lord said, "he that drinks shall never thirst."

The emblems of the Passion usually number amongst them a ladder, which, if Our Lord was nailed to His cross extended on the rocky surface of Calvary, would not be needful; if, however, this was done as He stood upon a foot pace, it would. If the vinegar and gall were offered upon a reed it also would be necessary; if the "reed" should be translated "spear-haft," as some think, then it would not. If the deposition of the sacred body as usually portrayed in art be true, then a ladder would be again required; but if the cross were first lowered, as would be more likely, if it were possible, then it would be useless. The Passion-plays, however, probably made use of the ladder, and hence it would get its memorial among the flowers. The blood-wort centaury (*Erythræa centaurium*) with its red flower has the name in the old botany of *Christi scala;* Prior says, "we find it as Christis laddere in catalogues of the fourteenth century." In Gerarde's "Appendix" it is given as Christaldre, and in this form Halliwell and Wright have it with the note "spelt Cristes laddre," and explained centaurea major in MS. Sloane 5 f. 3." Warayne (iii. 320) includes the Perfoliate chlora (*C. perfoliata*) under the same name, and it is equally significant in appearance, for both represent the ancient form of ladders with central stem and foot-rests on either side, such as are still to be seen in many countries, not the usual one of our day, and the regularity of the leafage of these herbs upon either side of their stem suggested the simile. But besides this the *Erythræa* like other gentians (*Chlora inclula*) has singularly bitter qualities, and bears the names of gall of the earth, bitterherb or Fel trike, so that in this same plant they saw not

only the means of ascent by which the soldiers affixed the sacred victim to the tree or by which St. Joseph of Arimathy took the holy body down, but also the drink of gall that was proffered to the Saviour in response to the cry of "I thirst." The word comes from the verse in the Psalms, "Dederunt in escam Meam fel: et in siti Mea potaverunt me aceto," "They gave me gall for my food and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink"—"I in return give you the precious gentians for your consuming fevers and the vine to render your hearts merry." We have heard of sermons in stones, but what sermons in herbs there are never yet preached except by the pious heart to itself!

The bitter draught spoken of in the Gospels as vinegar was soaked into a sponge, and this, St. John says, was set upon hyssop, and thus proffered to the dying Lord. This hyssop has been the source of extensive discussion and many varied identifications. The search, however, has been hindered by men requiring to find some shrub with sufficient length of stem to raise the sponge to the requisite height. There was no need for this to be the case, for if we compare the Gospels, we find that St. Matthew and St. Mark mention that the sponge was placed upon a calamus or arundo, translated reed. We have already spoken of the possibility of this reed being the usual name for a spear-handle or shaft, and the learned and acute commentator Estius (in "Loca Difficiliora S. Scripturæ Johan.," xix.) considers that St. John's word *hyssopo* is an erroneous reading for *hysso*, meaning the same as the other evangelists. But at any rate we might regard the words as allowing the sense that the sponge was set among a bunch of hyssop previously bound to the end of a lance-pole to keep it in its place and arrest its contents trickling down when pressed. This appears to have been St. Augustine's opinion (in "Evang. Johan., Tract. xcix., de Cap. 19). In 1844 Professor Royle read a paper before the Royal Asiatic Society strongly urging the identity of the hyssop with the caper-bush (*Capparis*), whose flower-buds form a familiar pickle. They generally come from the East and West Indies, but the *Capparis Ægyptiaca* is an oriental tree, which springs, with bright leaves and white flowers, out of the dryest wall, thus fulfilling, it was thought, the other reference to the "hyssop of the wall," in connection with Solomon. Its long stems split at the end into brush-like fibres, recalling the use of the hyssop made by the Israelites to sprinkle their door-posts with the blood of the sacrificial lamb. The shrub has medical qualities as a stimulant, and also as an antiscorbutic and aperient, and its bark is likewise used for other remedial purposes, so that this may have been the shrub referred to. Others have deemed that the bitter wormwoods (*Artemisia*) were the hyssop of the cross, and

the southernwood (*A. abrotanum*) has the names in Austria of herrgottshölzel, in Hungary of tsten-faja, in Russia of boschie derewo, in Poland of boze drzwkko, in France sometimes it is l'herbe sainte, and the *A. vulgaris* is himmelker or himmel's rehr in various parts of Germany. The pretty silvery leaves have valuable stomachic properties, and one of this family yields the *mosca*, a substance much used in the east in cautery by burning it upon the parts affected with gout, rheumatism, etc.

The common hyssop (*Hyssopus officinalis*) of the south of Europe is said to be seen entwined about the Saviour's brow in some early representations of the crucifixion. The aspersoir or aspergillum of the early Church is said to have been a bunch of hyssop, and to have continued so for many centuries, both in mindfulness of the Israelites using it at the sprinkling of their homes with the atoning blood and to the words used when employed in the service of the Church: "Asperge me Domine hyssopo," etc. In Southern France the holy-water sprinkler is still called the tsop or hyssop, according to the learned author Agaïs. This plant is gathered by the passer-by in Sicily, to be dipped in the holy water when the priest blesses their fields at rogation-tide, and is known in Germany as kircheneisbeth, kirchenhysop or klosterhysop. Walcott says altars were washed with it on Maundy-Thursday. Species of the same plant are found in the east, and it does not seem improbable that these traditions have continued to preserve the original plant employed at the crucifixion. Some such sweet herb as the labiate savory, or *Satureia*, has been apparently thought probable, for we find that in Alsace to be known as kirch-hyssop. The hyssop of Solomon has been generally considered some minute form of vegetation as demonstrating the scope of his intelligence, and the dwarf species of *Bryum* found in moist places is that usually chosen, and in Norway they still know it as "Solomon's wisdom."

Having done their work, the soldiers sat down to cast lots for the raiment of the prisoners, which was possibly a perquisite of their office. Our Blessed Lord had been clothed with a white robe before Herod, a purple or red one before Pilate, and with His own upon Calvary. The *Tunica inconsutilis*, or Seamless Vestment of the Saviour, now one of the great relics of Trêves, is said to have been woven for Him by His Mother, and the union of Mother and Son may be found in the sacred dedication in a plant that still bears its Arabic name of Al Kemelyeh, or the Great Sanicle (*Alchemilla vulgaris*). Throughout Europe it is more especially known as Our Lady's Mantle, but in the Rhineland it remains still herrgottsmäntelchen. It is one of the vulnerary sanguisorbias, astringent and slightly tonic, and it was thus the more

valued. Probably, too, the old Latin name of *Tunica herba*, given to various species of betony, arose from a similar alliance of thought, the utilities of which are so great that the Italians have a saying: "May you have more virtues than betony," and this sacred connection between our Lord's Robe and this flower is the more likely among a people who vividly realized the virtue that flowed from touching even the hem of His garment. One of the same family (*Stachus lanata*) has the curious name in Sussex of "Our Saviour's Blanket," for it is striped, and might thus have been called by some pilgrim who had seen the striped blanket-garment used by the Arabs of the East. The *Stachys Arabica* is violet or purple, and may then recall the robe of scorn before Pilate. The early crusaders and pilgrims visiting Egypt found in the flora there the handsome thorn-apple, Arabic *Tatorch* (*Datura fastuosa*), and saw in its beautiful blossom of white fringed with purple the emblem of this same woollen tunic or vestment, and hence it became Tunicas de Cristo in Spain, or Manteau de Christ in France, as it remains to-day. Its title was carried by the early missionaries when they found the same shrub in their Mexican and South American woods, giving forth the delicious fragrance of its memorial of the cross to every evening breeze, and where it is thus spoken of, or as the Trumpet of the Doom. Our wild convolvulus flowers, either white or red or striped, have also served as memorials of these robes of the Saviour at His Passion, and one would expect to find the dice-box by which the lot was determined to be recalled by the checkered fribillary flower (*Fribillaria*), but we know only of the name of herrgottschügelcher for the *Montana* species.

We must omit any further memorials, for we have already been too long, and yet it is hard to pass over the tender recollections which many a flower prompted to the Sacred Wounds, Precious Blood, the Holy Sepulture and its pious attendants, and finally we must omit that more modern and exquisite summary of this great tragedy, the flower known now pre-eminently as the passion-flower.

The Passion of our Blessed Lord began in a garden, and we end it in the peace of the Garden of Calvary, with its pure shrubs and flowers breathing only the fragrance of their sympathy and prompting holy thoughts and aspirations. Perhaps the sacredness of a garden may appear greater to some of us after learning how full of holy lore it may be made. Many an old botanist loved to dwell upon the very natural reflection of how gardens have been consecrated by their connection with the greatest epochs in human existence. They loved to tell how in a garden it was the first Adam fell, and how in another the second Adam endured the agony to

redeem that fall. It is not so often remarked how in a garden the Lord of Heaven and Earth was buried, and there arose again to life. It was this latter thought especially that gave rise to the Christian's care of his dead, not placing them in rocks, like the Egyptians, or on the roadsides, like the Romans, or cremating them, as the Hindoos, but making their *cemeterion*, or sleeping-place, in a garden, where green herbage and bright flowers might tell of the Saviour's tomb and the hope it brought of the resurrection morn. It was from the sacredness of the ground around where the body still lay in the mystery of the Mass, that the space adjoining a church became called the Paradise, a name still retained in the French *parvis*, for the open court before a cathedral church, and in our English word *parvise*, for the chamber above our porches, as a place where priests might pray for those who slept within the church's garth; and in every old burial-place arose a Mount of Olivet, with the scene of the Agony, or a Calvary, with its cross to throw its shadow over its sleeping dead, as did that in far-off Jewry over the garden of the Holy Sepulchre.

We commend, then, to our readers this study of the sacred flora as a wide and inspiring field of fresh interest, a continual source of mingled instructiveness and of food for the highest thought. To the men of the moyen âge the Kalendar has been said to have been Devotion's Diary and Mirth's Manual, and we might add that nature was its illustrated Supplement. Birds, flowers and stars were all enlisted to help them in the expression of their rational enjoyment in life; their bodies and souls, minds and hearts, were all united in making the completion of their happiness—not treated as separate entities—so that if the body was rejoicing, the soul should be silent. The feast was not complete without Jesus and Mary. Then the world was truly merrie when men looked to the Church and to nature as the partners of their mirth. Carol-tyde brought with it festivities of every kind, but all prompted by the commemoration that it honored. Nature helped, with its lessons and illustrations, to increase the mirthfulness of man, and the Burning Bush of Holly, the Jesse Tree of Mistletoe, the Christmas Roses of the Shepherd Maid, Stars of Bethlehem for the Epiphany, and many another emblem it offered to deck the churches and homes of the people. Passion-tyde and Easter came on, and again in the floral division of natural subjects emblems and types were appearing on every roadside and meadow to help man's recollected and appreciative gaze. Trinity, Pentecost, Corpus Christi and the Assumption followed, completing those Seven Stars, the Constellation of the Church's Year, and for them all nature rendered its tribute and earth yielded its fruit. Not only were the memorials in nature confined to the great feasts or fasts, for scat-

tered on every side about that firmament in which shone the seven greater lights are to be found, as lesser luminaries, the saints of God whose dedications among the flowers range from a single bud to the Galaxy of Mary or the via picta of the Baptist. What a new world of delight there is in this study! What a vision of peace it reveals in its intellectual, artistic and spiritual resources! What a field of delight to ourselves and our children would not the cultivation of a garden afford if we made it an earthly paradise, a hortus deliciarum, reflecting in tree and flower, by emblem and association, the Heavenly One? Where is the limit to the real education—the leading forth of man's mental and moral capabilities—which such assistance would bestow, giving education in its highest, widest and truest sense? Children have an innate love of nature, and the most profound truths in dogmatic theology, to say nothing of the most needful lessons in moral culture, can be taught with the most penetrating and lasting effect if natural symbolism be employed. The sweet purity of child-life, undimmed by the world's blight, drinks in lessons from the flowers, as the bee imbibes and assimilates their honey, and yet we scarcely ever find it employed. Is reverence for nature diminished, the religious truth forgotten, or the instruction wearisome when the mother points to the robin's scarlet breast or the cross-bill's twisted beak, and repeats to the eager listener what pious hearts have told as to how those badges were won? Will a child recklessly pluck or wantonly injure the *Nigella* with the dimmed eye, or the blood-sprinkled cuckoo-pint, or *Orchis*, if he know what they recalled to Christian eyes long closed? It was never as needful as it is to-day that parents should encourage such a love for nature, and it eminently belongs to home-teaching to foster the dispositions which such teaching engenders.

> "Earth's crammed with heaven,
> And every common bush afire with God."

Alfred E. P. Raymund Dowling, B.A., Oxon.

IMPRESSIONS PRODUCED BY "APOSTOLICÆ CURÆ."

MANY months have now elapsed since the publication of the Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ"; and although its effects on the English mind are very far from having developed themselves as yet, we may look around and record the first impressions made by that remarkable document. The scope of this article does not include any sort of theological discussion, either of the Bull itself or of the reply of the Anglican Archbishops; it merely aims at showing the sparks struck from the endlessly diverse minds of English religionists by the friction of a great historical event.

While the cause of Anglican Orders was yet *sub judice*, I ventured to foretell in these columns what would be the manner of reception by the High Church party of a possible adverse decision. The decision was adverse, and it has been received exactly as I supposed. When first, at the end of September, 1896, the Papal brief arrived in England, a tempest of indignation raged through all the pulpits and periodicals which expressed the varied gamut of High Church opinion. Vexed to the soul as were the Sacerdotalists, to say nothing of the large number of Anglicans who believe that they have Orders, without any defined idea of what Orders are, they professed not to care about the decision in the least degree. It would not hurt them; they had not challenged it, and they were profoundly indifferent to it; it would tell only against the Roman Church, hindering conversions, postponing reunion indefinitely. Considering how very little Anglicans cared, it is strange that their language should have struck every note of anger and vexation, from the sorrowfully reproachful to the inconsiderately bitter and undisguisedly infuriated.

The Anglican weekly newspapers were all agreed in attributing the Papal decision to the most unworthy motives, and in remaining blind to any possibility of its being based on historical conviction.

"The Guardian" has all along treated the subject in the refined Oxonian style which always distinguishes this oldest and stateliest of English clerical journals. From the first it abstained from railing accusations or insults; yet it is unable to refuse to itself the

saving hypothesis that the pronouncement from Rome is only a stroke of policy.

"An inquiry undertaken in the interests of historical truth," thus spake "The Guardian" of September 30th, "has been made to minister to the needs of practical policy. The aspect, as we cannot but believe, which the question ultimately assumed was not so much, 'Are Anglican Orders valid,' as 'What will be the effect in England of pronouncing them valid?' And this view of a great duty was partly excused on the ground that it had often been taken in all churches." The article continued in the same strain with regard to the Catholic authorities in England, on whom the blame of the adverse decision was universally laid. "We do not doubt that they were honestly of opinion that a Papal recognition of Anglican Orders would be injurious to the salvation of souls and the interests of true religion. They have yet to learn that these great ends will not be served in the long run by presentment of the facts of history in the garb of ecclesiastical partisanship."

"The Church Times," which is the distinctly Ritualistic organ, was much more violent in its language. From this paper one expects everything that is most anti-Papal, and the expectation is seldom disappointed. The tone initiated by the late Dr. Littledale, and continued by the present editor, has been fully sustained ever since the Papal pronouncement fluttered all the Anglican dovecotes in September, 1896; a tone of professed contempt which is curiously belied by the evident undercurrent of bitter disappointment. "Some of our kings, in earlier times, would have thrown it (the Bull) into the sea," proudly exclaimed an editorial of September 25, 1896, as if any question could ever have been raised as to the ordination of English priests in the ages when England was an avowedly Catholic country, in communion with the rest of Christendom. But when we see, in the same number of "The Church Times," among the "Answers to Correspondents," an assertion that "the Greeks do not recognize the validity of Roman Orders," we remember that *ira est brevis furor*, and we begin to make allowances for the *chagrin* of the editor at such a time. It must, however, be admitted that his ire has not at all abated during the many months which have elapsed since the blow fell; and that the numerous aggrieved clergymen who unbosomed themselves in his sympathetic columns fully rivalled in heat of diction his own vehement expressions of contempt. But all this editorial and epistolary violence was fairly outdone by "Church Bells," another widely read Anglican Sunday paper, and one which is supposed to represent that stratum of Anglican opinion which is called "Moderate High Church." "Church

Bells" was not at all moderate in its expressions concerning the Papal Bull. In a leading article headed "Rome the Treacherous," it drew the following highly colored picture: "At our threshold stands the Roman Cardinal, who, ever alert, vigilant and ambitious, has, in a victory scarcely triumphant, because almost unopposed, and, as regards reunion, more disastrous in its results than any defeat, wrested from his Sovereign Pontiff a Bull which is no less an unworthy attack upon our historic Church than an uncalled for, an ignoble insult to our beloved Sovereign and the English nation. . . . . The intention of the Bull is plain; it pronounces our Orders invalid, so that, hopeless, homeless and sore afraid, we may, accepting the Papal dictum, turn Romeward for comfort. We doubt if the people of this nation have ever quite gathered what is the full significance of the Roman argument and belief that our threefold order of the ministry is worthless." This outburst is followed by one of those exposures of ignorance which always so seriously detract from the dramatic effect of foregoing indignation. The editor infers from the non-recognition of Anglican Orders that the Pope has *ipso facto* pronounced English marriages invalid, and asks, "Can we listen to the voice of any, be he Cardinal or Pontiff, who holds us to be a nation of bastards . . . . *our children illegitimate and unchristened?*" This was a bold bid for a public outcry; but there must be a good many English people who know, 1st, that the Church of Rome holds marriages in England, which have been celebrated according to English law, to be valid, except only those of divorced persons; 2d, that it holds lay baptism to be valid also. And indeed the English public do not seem to have been seriously misled by these statements, except, perhaps, that small pious section which takes its faith from irresponsible pronouncements uttered *ex cathedra editoris.*

Then the Church newspapers seized with avidity on a semi-private document which "Fathers" Puller and Lacey had published in "The Guardian," and which was nothing more nor less than an answer to, or report on, the pamphlet "De Re Anglicana," another semi-private argument, written by these two Anglican monks in the hope of influencing the Holy Father and his advisers. The answer was composed by two great English historians and theologians, Dr. Gasquet and Monsignor Moyes; and they became convenient scapegoats on whom to vent the spleen which a certain remnant of reverence warded off from the Pontiff himself. One could forgive a good deal to the angry disappointment and sore hearts of "Anglo-Catholics," but an accusation of unfairness against two men so accurate in fact as Dr. Gasquet and Monsignor Moyes can only amuse those who know these divines either per-

sonally or as historians.[1] It would indeed have been well if Protestant writers had rivalled Dom Gasquet in avoidance of all rhetorical passion and distortion of fact; if they saw black as black, and white as white, with the clear vision of the learned Benedictine. Father Puller, indeed, did full justice to Dr. Gasquet's standard historical works, in a letter which he wrote to "The Guardian" on the subject of "De Re Anglicana" and the Risposta; but he also tried to show that the historian in the Risposta has purposely contradicted his own book on "Edward VI." for the sake of misleading the Pope about the status of the Edwardine clergy. A glance will show that it is Mr. Puller who is at once misleader and misled.

The bishops of Edward's time whom Dr. Gasquet calls "Catholic," *e.g.*, those holding the body of Catholic doctrine, though they had temporized on the matter of the Papal Supremacy, were easily reconciled to Rome when they made their submission on this head. None of them had been ordained or consecrated according to the Edwardine Ordinal; therefore their Orders were not called in question. But Father Puller makes it appear that their reconciliation and reinstatement under Mary was a proof that Rome at that time regarded the Edwardine ordinations as valid.

While the tempest raged in Sacerdotalist and High Anglican circles, the Low Church party in the Church of England, no less than their kindred in religion, the Dissenters without the gates, were in the position of spectators rather than of interested parties; but this did not prevent them from taking sides more or less warmly. There were many Evangelicals whose extreme dislike to the introduction of Sacerdotalism into their Church caused them to long for and welcome with delight a Papal decision which should cut the ground from under the innovator's feet. "The Pope," they said, "must know what priesthood is, or is supposed to be; his Church has always claimed to possess it, whereas ours repudiated from the first all idea of a priesthood offering sacrifice, and has only presbyters who preach and offer prayer. Let him put

[1] In 1894 I had the honor of writing, in these columns, a synopsis of the works of Dom Gasquet; then I specially called attention to the almost unexampled calmness and candor of his style. With regard to Mgr. Moyes, I may perhaps be allowed to say, as a contributor to "The Dublin Review," of which he is the editor, that he puts no limits to the telling of the truth. In the course of a mediæval study I came on facts highly derogatory to the probity and honor of one of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and mentioned the embarrassing circumstance to Canon Moyes. He bade me lay it down as a principle, that history must always be absolutely candid, however much the facts of the case may go against the grain with the historian. "Nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice," is the guiding maxim of both the ecclesiastics whom Ritualists malign as having held a brief against their cause.

these usurping presbyters who want to offer sacrifice back into their own position." This is precisely what Leo XIII. did, and the anti-Ritualists were somewhat maliciously rejoiced at the sensation caused thereby in the enemy's camp. There was, however, another party of Protestants which could not resist the temptation to have a fling at the Pope, even at the expense of a temporary sympathy with Ritualists; and which, though not believing in Orders, resented his opinion that the Anglicans had none.

Very different from the attitude of any of these partisans was that of the daily press. With but few exceptions the secular journals took a lucid outsider's view of the situation; the sort of view which would be taken by anyone not in bondage to the modern fiction about the continuity of the Establishment with the ancient English Church. The Pope had given what from his point of view was the only common sense answer to the recent proposition; and the Established Church must rest content with its position as the most highly placed among the Reformation churches.

But the Anglican papers parry these remarks by saying that the secular press of England is to a large extent under Roman Catholic influence. If this is true—and to some extent it is true—one wonders how the comparative monopoly has arisen; and whether the High Anglican party has no clever all-round writers, capable of making for themselves a position in the secular press, whence they can influence the public much more effectually than when addressing the limited circle who read religious journals.

The Church Congress, which happened to take place immediately after the publication of the Bull, gave an opportunity to the whole clerical body, or to as much of it as believed itself to have Orders, publicly to vent its anger and disappointment. In justice, however, it must be admitted that very little of vituperation, either in speech or writing, was directly levelled at the head of the venerable Pontiff himself. His action was described as "deplorable," "injudicious," "ill-timed"; his pronouncement was fiercely challenged or angrily sneered at; but the blame of both, on the platform as in the press, was very generally shifted on the shoulders of his English advisers—not only of the theologians who were on the Commission, but of Cardinal Vaughan and the Bishops of England. The motives attributed to them, impossible as they are, would very naturally co-exist with the frame of mind in which Protestants habitually live with regard to matters ecclesiastical. Such charges would, indeed, be insulting as well as foolish, if brought forward by men whose consciences were less entirely warped on the subject of faith and expediency than are those of High Anglicans. But they view these things

from an impossible standpoint. The necessity of unity and authority being entirely put out of sight, and the question of Orders or no Orders taking precedence of every other in their minds, they assume that if the priesthood of the Anglican clergy were admitted, Cardinal Vaughan and the Catholic hierarchy would lose their *raison d'etre*, and must of necessity resign their crooks to the prelates of the Establishment. And, moreover, since Anglicans have been accustomed to see their own prelates trim their sails to suit prevailing winds, and their historians twist facts till they are tortured into proofs of the most impossible theories ever known, they naturally argue that Catholic bishops and learned men would commit any injustice, and falsify history to any extent, rather than allow themselves to be superseded. The correspondent of "The Church Times" even suggested that "the English Roman clergy" dreaded the admission of Anglican clergymen to the status of Catholic priests, on account of their superiority as being more "colti e civili," in Cardinal Manning's phrase, than the missionaries of Rome. Of course, no one who is well acquainted with England or with English Catholicism would deny that the latter is indebted, in an untold degree, to the social qualities of those convert clergymen who have become priests, and who have brought with them the polished tone of the English gentleman, the refined culture of the Oxford or Cambridge man. But the very idea of the Catholic priest dreading rivalry on his own ground from the Anglican parson could but exist, as the French would say, "pour rire."

The whole assumption is so unworthy, and opens out such a vista of low motive and falsified conscience on the part of the accusers, that one is sorry, for their own sake, that they should make parade of it before the world. Most of them have failed to see that a declaration on the part of the Pope that he had absolute proof of the validity of Anglican Orders would have made no difference whatever to the *status quo*. Anglicans would have been proved to be in possession of a priesthood, but they would still have been schismatics, out of communion with the See of St. Peter. The Pope would still have had to maintain and support bishops here, just as he does in the dominion of the Tzar. And even the case of Russia, though it is a case very much to the point, is not quite parallel with that of a schismatic England. The Russian Church, owing to its cohesion and retention of the great body of Christian doctrine, might, if it so wished, be reunited with Rome *en bloc*. But in the Anglican Church every bishop, clergyman, and layman would have to be examined separately as to his belief, so that Anglicans would be reduced to individual submission after all. There are prelates and clergy in the Church of

England who would not believe themselves to be sacrificing priests if the matter were proved up to the hilt; and who, had the Pope been able to decide in favor of their Orders, would have repudiated the claim with indignation. There are laity with their religious ideas in every phase of disruption; there is an immense body of people who loosely call themselves "Church of England," and who have no tenets at all. Thus, reunion would not have been an ace nearer had the Edwardine Ordinal been never so valid.

It is curious how persistently all these things are blinked at by Anglicans. One of the few among them who have taken a partially correct view of the position was the late Canon Churton. In a letter from his pen which appeared in "Church Bells," of October 30, 1896, he wrote: "It is surely an error to suppose that any utterance from Rome on the subject of the bare validity of English ordinations would have established the Anglican position, or have in any way affected the position of the Roman Mission in Great Britain. The See of Rome, in consequence of its claim to be the source of spiritual jurisdiction, plants ecclesiastical organizations in all lands, and is bound by its principles to be aggressive on other communities, whether they have lost or retained the Apostolic succession. . . . . A schismatical Church therefore gains nothing in position by possessing these bare essentials. The formation of an Anglican Uniat Church, or a Church in submission to Rome having permission to use its own rites, would have been in accordance with these precedents." Canon Churton evidently came fairly near to appreciating the situation. But probably the necessity for submission to Rome would not have been felt, or would have been felt only by the few; and a sort of new sect, detached from the State, would have been the earliest result of an acknowledged possession of true orders.

There was from the first a natural feeling among indignant Anglicans that an authoritative answer should be sent to the Pope. The sudden death of Dr. Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, on October 11th, caused a delay in the preparation of such a document; although it is said that the thoughts of that truly good and estimable prelate, during the last days of his life, were much occupied by the Papal pronouncement. He also left behind him some memoranda towards an official reply. It was not till March that Dr. Temple, the new Archbishop, together with his brother of York, gave to the world what is called by Anglicans the Encyclical *Satis cognitum*—a courteous, dignified, and scholarly, but certainly not a priestly or an Episcopal document. Of this letter it is not in my province further to speak, except to say that the Catholic and orthodox conception of the Sacrament of Order and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and that set forth by Drs. Temple and

Maclagan, is so radically different that the Pope and the Archbishops seem to be arguing from quite separate standpoints. The standpoint of the Archbishops is their own private ground, shared, perhaps, by that Moderate High Church party which is represented by "The Guardian" newspaper. For although it suited the rampantly Ritualistic "Church Times" to applaud the attitude of the Archbishops, at any less critical time its editor would probably have taken exception to their view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as being nearly everything except the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Under the circumstances, however, the editor of "The Church Times" elected to strike the chord of submission and approbation. "It is with profound thankfulness," he announced on March 12th, "that we read this Encyclical. The true doctrine of the priesthood and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is here declared, with an authority that cannot be gainsaid, to be the teaching of the Church of England." Thereupon "The Catholic Times" very pertinently asked since when their Graces had been in possession of such authority. "The Church Times" itself has never recognized their authority when clashing with its own. In one of its last issues, which appeared before the death of Archbishop Benson, it took him to task for having "of late somewhat ostentatiously employed that unhappy expression, 'Protection,' in connection with Anglicanism." And by the opposing party in the Church of England the authority was gainsaid at once. In the eyes of Evangelicals the Encyclical assumed too much of sacerdotal power and sacramental belief. It ought not to have spoken of an Eucharistic Sacrifice at all, it ought not to have laid claim to episcopacy and priesthood. Even the dignified courtesy of its tone as regards the Pope, to which Catholics have done full justice, gave offence in some quarters within the Anglican pale; not, probably, in the sense that Evangelicals wished the Pope to be treated discourteously, but that they grudged any assumption on the part of their Bishops of a like power with his.

But the case was put in a nutshell, as it were, by Cardinal Vaughan, in an address which he delivered at Great Ormond Street on March 14th:[1] "According to the Anglican Archbishops, the Anglican priesthood claims no miraculous, supernatural, sacrificial powers, such as are exercised by the priesthood of the Eastern and Western Churches. So far, therefore, according to their own showing, the Anglican is as different from the Roman and Greek priesthood as their sacrifice is different from ours. Under these circumstances I fail to understand why they complain

[1] Since published by the Catholic Truth Society.

of the judgment of the Pope, who is bound to pronounce judgment from the standpoint of Catholic doctrine, and must be understood to refer to the priesthood in a Catholic sense."

And "The Tablet" further remarked that it was to the credit of the Anglican Archbishops that they did not set forth that the Church of England held her bishops and priests to possess a true sacrificing priesthood, with the mystic power to cause Christ to be really present at the altar, and to offer Christ as the Victim of Salvation in the sacrifice of the Mass, even as taught by the Church of Rome and the Churches of the East.

What, indeed, would have been the effect of such a declaration on the Evangelicals, seeing that even the Archbishops' claim to offer "praise and thanksgiving, the oblation of ourselves, and the memory of the Sacrifice on the Cross," seemed to them too sacerdotal!

As to the outcry caused by Leo XIII.'s suggestion to Cardinal Vaughan, that a fund should be raised for the succor of convert clergymen, nothing can be more wanting in common sense than the endeavor to associate such a project with any idea of "bribery." Catholics in England are so poor that they can hardly support their own missions and institutions; they come in, as one of the Anglican papers has viciously remarked, at the tail of all public subscriptions. The rich among them are not noted for any imprudent zeal in encouraging Catholic effort, or in smoothing the path of the self-impoverished convert. To suppose that English Catholics could raise a fund which should compensate clergymen for the loss of a living, or even of a curacy, is to revive that utterly baseless Protestant superstition that the Church has unlimited power and wealth at her command, and always brings them out for the benefit of those who do her service. In reality, a few pounds, or some little help towards starting a business, will be the most that the convert will receive in exchange for all that he had; and very often he will not even get that. Poverty and neglect will be his lot in this world; and it is obvious that his motives must be entirely concerned with the next when he throws up employments and offends his relatives in order to join the Catholic Church.

So far, no great movement towards the Church has resulted from the Papal pronouncement. The well-known and much-esteemed "Father" Maturin, of the Anglican Monastery of Cowley, two beneficed clergymen, and at least two curates, have had the courage of their convictions and have made their submission. The air is still full of the noise and dust of the encounter. The Ritualists generally have shown more ecclesiastical swagger than ever, while the Moderates have become more Ritualistic. Certain

external circumstances have encouraged Anglicans to assume a bold attitude. In the first burst of their disappointment they exclaimed that they would turn for fellowship to the ancient Churches of the East, who are like them only in that "Non Serviam" is the motto of all.

They had already sent what they called a "legate" to the coronation of the Tzar in the person of the Bishop of Peterborough; and now in the present year the Archbishop of Finland has come to the Queen's Jubilee, has stood among Anglican bishops at the West Front of St. Paul's, has visited Oxford, has had the "Is Polla ita Despota" sung before him by High Anglican choirs, and, at his departure from Victoria Station, passed among a crowd who knelt to receive his blessing. All this looked so like reunion in the eyes of good people who are accustomed to consider superficials more than essentials, that a sense of triumph in the apparent fraternization with an Eastern hierarch soothed the hearts so deeply wounded by the aloofness of Rome. The slight vexation caused by the presence of the Papal Legate in the Jubilee procession itself—for the Queen, with the good sense and fine manners which have always distinguished her, never fails to do honor to the representatives of Leo XIII.—was compensated for by this opportunity of offering homage to an Eastern prelate. An incident, too, has been raked up which happened ten years ago, when the Archbishop of Kief asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to "communicate to him, distinctly and definitely, on what conditions he considered the union of the Churches possible." It is clear that Archbishop Benson did not see his way to tackle this difficult problem, and its solution can hardly be looked upon as a probability. At all events, we shall wait to be astonished until the Holy Synod has pronounced on the validity of Anglican Orders, and further discovered a *modus vivendi* with clergymen of many shades of opinion on the subject of the Christian Sacrifice. It is not unlikely that Orientals, even as the French Abbés Portal and Duchesne, might at the first blush take a different view of the priestliness of Anglicans from what we in England take. They see a bishop with mitre and crook, and do not realize that these things are an innovation which would have shocked the bishops of thirty years ago. They see a parson who wears vestments, and who is good and earnest in his way; they do not know him as we know him; they cannot apprehend the looseness of his reasoning, the laxity of his conscience in matters of faith, the contradictions that beset the religious system in which he lives, and the unsacerdotal character which is so evident to his own countrymen. We know the English parson too well ever to have had the smallest suspicion that he was a priest. We are acquainted with both his

strong and his weak points. We like him for his scholarship, his *bonhommie*, his kindness to the poor, the respectability of his private life. We laugh at him (especially if he be a Ritualist) for his anomalous position, his priestly pretensions, his censure of his bishops at the very same time that he is holding them up as the equals of the Pope, his general incapacity for logic in things ecclesiastical. The bishops themselves are a study not devoid of humor, as are also their wives; those estimable ladies who have lately come to the front so valiantly in public matters that some of the austere High Church journals have satirically recommended them to sign themselves by the names of their husbands' episcopal sees. All these things are always before our eyes; and the Oriental Church, should it give itself seriously to a study of the ways and means of reunion, would find them (and many other things even more important) awkward factors to deal with.

Nothing but good can result from telling the truth where souls have been deceived; and no doubt many a deeply religious Anglican will settle down to a serious review of his position when the first storm of anger has spent itself, and the glories of the Pan-Anglican synod and celebration of St. Augustine's thirteenth centenary have passed away. Much would be gained if the Ritualists would consider the rock from which they were hewn; if they would study the history of the Movement of 1833 and following years, as recounted by a witness so unexceptionable, so truthful, scholarly and refined as the Anglican Dean Church.[1] There was something pathetic and noble in the long clinging to Anglicanism of the Tractarians; in their hoping against hope, their hard inward struggle, the submission of some among them when conscience made the way clear at last. Would that their scholastic calm and deep searching of heart could be given to their spiritual descendants, so that the jangling about vestments, Roman and Sarum uses, recalcitrant bishops and "un-Churchlike views" might cease, and the people begin to think, not of what they wish to be true, but of what God has decreed! If their Sunday newspapers and their clergy would give them time for reflection, they would know that the Lord is not in the storm nor in the earthquake, but speaks with a still, small voice.

Signs are not wanting to show that the future is likely to bring about a blissful development of the present situation. Two things are certain, namely, that the general longing for reunion has not been diminished because the particular path to it chosen by the self-will of a few is declared to be forever barred, and that the governing tendency in the Anglican Church at present is towards

[1] *The Oxford Movement*, by R. W. Church, London, 1892.

a hierarchical and sacramental system. Say what the Evangelicals may, protest as they will, the set of the tide is towards sacerdotalism. If anything more were wanted to prove it than a common power of perception of surrounding things, the want would be supplied by the attitude of the majority among the bishops. It has always been a noted fact that the Anglican bishops, as a body, have rather followed than led public opinion in matters ecclesiastical. Some, almost any, party in the Church forms a powerful current which counteracts, for the time, all other currents; and forthwith the bishops, tentative, rather dilatory, always politic, begin gently to drift in the same direction. There is not one of the present bench, except Dr. King, of Lincoln, who has boldly declared himself to be all, or nearly all, that a Catholic bishop is; yet most of the others have gradually approached to something more or less resembling the ideal, and have sloughed off, cautiously and by degrees, Low Church or Broad Church ways of doing and talking. They wear copes; at times even mitres;[1] they have crooks carried before them; they officiate in churches where "High Mass" is sung in their presence; they brave the anger of the decadent Evangelical party. There are exceptions, of course. Lately there was a scene in a certain church, when the bishop of the diocese objected to lighted candles on the altar; and when the vicar pulled out his watch and gave his lordship one minute to decide whether he would refuse to administer Confirmation in that church, submitting to the presence of the candles; and the bishop, for the sake of peace, chose the latter alternative. Then too, the bishops generally, who as State officers must needs obey the law of the State, are continually being called to order by the High Anglican press on the serious matter of the marriages of divorced persons; they do not, because they cannot, forbid the celebration of these marriages in their churches. But as a whole, friction on this side is growing more and more rare; and the prelates are now defied mostly by Protestant fanatics, such as the man who called out "Traitor!" as the Archbishop of York drove through the streets of Sheffield; or another similar spirit who has threatened His Grace with a similar greeting at any time that he takes his walks or drives abroad. Puritanism, it would appear, is falling on the days of its second childhood; but it keeps its harsh and abusive spirit to the last.

But Ritualism grows and increases. If, as some Catholics think, it be from Satan, certainly the enemy of mankind has overreached

[1] It was observed that the Archbishop did not wear a mitre at the Thanksgiving Service in front of St. Paul's on Jubilee Day; Her Majesty having an objection—founded, perhaps, on her well-known quality of common sense—to see the State prelates arrayed in this episcopal headgear.

himself this time. Ritualism is a tide carrying the most devout and cultured portion of the English nation into port. It has introduced valid baptism, acts of contrition, spiritual communions, devotion to Our Lady, prayers for the dead; all of which things are good in themselves, and likely to lead to further good in the future. And if Ritualists are apt to be quarrelsome, one must remember that there will often be pettishnesses and discontents in an infant school.

That reunion is still in the air is the most hopeful sign of all. The Anglican "Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom" lately presented an address to the Bishops of the Pan-Anglican Conference at Lambeth, setting forth that although the first attempt to promote good relations with the See of Rome had failed, "the fact that the inquiry was the outcome of an enthusiasm for unity in loving hearts of the great Latin communion is a sign of the powerful working of the spirit of peace." The writers further remark that "no one can read the Encyclical of Leo XIII., or the reply of the English Archbishops, without recognizing with deep thankfulness the change which has come over the manner of conducting controversy between Rome and Canterbury. Both sides have spoken what they believe to be the truth, but they have spoken it in love, and though the consequences of the sixteenth-century upheaval remain, we may congratulate ourselves that the violence of the passions aroused at that epoch is passing away." The archbishops are asked to appoint some feast for special prayers for reunion; and they have designated Pentecost, in accordance, as it would seem, with the thought of Leo XIII. The memorialists are right; the spirit of peace and good-will which prevails is in itself a pledge of coming unity. The atmosphere of bitter, railing, raging controversy which formerly enveloped Protestant polemics, must have been nearly fatal to impressions of truth. And though the tradition of abuse as a necessary ingredient of religious discussion is kept up to some extent by the "Rock" and the "Church Times," among Protestants in general it has died almost completely away, and is looked on as ill-mannered, unworthy, and un-Christian. And there is nothing which may not be accomplished by the spirit of loving kindness.

It seems as if a serious meditation on two elementary truths, *i.e.*, their positions as creatures, and the love of the Creator, would bring all these well-meaning English souls once for all into the haven where they should be. For, as creatures, they are bound to do the Creator's will; and His will is that the whole human race should be included in the great system which His love founded for the guidance of souls. He would never have condemned us

to find out a religion for ourselves; He knows our jangling minds too well. It is the human will refusing to obey, the human intellect over-confident in its own shallow wisdom, that have invented courses not marked on the chart He has given to us; and many shipwrecks have been the consequence. Anglicans have but to open their minds freely and frankly to these truths, and their wanderings will be happily at an end.

A. M. Grange.

FACT AND FICTION IN LITERATURE.

It seems a strange outcome of our present civilization that, in an age in which so many facts of transcendent interest exist for the admiration of such as choose to take notice of them, the majority of leisured men prefer to leave the world of fact for that of fiction. That such, at least, is the case would appear from the statistics of most free libraries, in which more than half, and sometimes as much as three-fourths of the books taken out are works of fiction. And if we turn to the literary journals we find evidence to the same effect when we read the formidable catalogue of "Novels of the Week," with criticisms thereon. The public never grows weary of fresh novels and of fresh stories, serial and otherwise. Fortunes are made by the circulation of a single book, while the sale of volumes from indifferent writers, whose name is legion, floods the market, and often drives out works of far higher merit. Yet still the cry is for more. Advertisements are sometimes found of classes for teaching young ladies how to qualify as authoresses under the guidance of one who has herself done much towards beguiling the weary hours of leisured humanity. If an intelligent visitor from the thirteenth century were, after five hundred years of sleep, suddenly to awake in the midst of our present nineteenth century civilization, he would, perhaps, be struck by nothing so much as by the means we have at our command for saving time and earning useful leisure. The printing-press, the locomotive and the whole array of our industrial machinery would seem to him, by the rapidity with which they do their work, to be admirably adapted for freeing mankind from that slavery to material labor which is such an obstacle to the higher intellectual life. He would think of the monks of his own day who gave up the whole of their spare time to copying

out manuscripts. If all this energy had been expended in reading, preaching and composing books, to be multiplied indefinitely with small trouble and expense, what good might not have been done to the world? Soon, moreover, our wondering philosopher would be introduced by his friend, proud of this chance of playing the showman, to some of the ways in which we spend our easily earned leisure. And first of all, in due course, he would be instructed about our methods of education and the means adopted by the State to secure the proper enlightenment of its children. He would find out before long, by intelligent questioning, that, with the majority, this education is thought to be complete when the product of the system is able to read, and, to some extent, understand a novel or a newspaper. After that he is left to shift for himself—to form his own opinions, choose his own occupation, and employ his leisure in his own way. Our newly awakened guest, thus far satisfied, would then go on to examine for himself the nature of these novels and newspapers which are to complete a young man's education, and in which he has been told the best thought of the day finds its expression. He is at once struck by the extreme ease and brilliancy with which the romances are written, the artistic grace of the characters and the plots, the luminous beauty and originality of the ideas, and, withal, the good general moral tone that pervades them. After a while, however, he begins to discover, for his wits have been preternaturally sharpened by his five centuries of rest, that the ideas are not so original as he at first supposed, that the brilliant language is repeated according to the same mould and pattern in all the volumes, and that the moral tone of many, especially the later productions is, if not evil in itself, at any rate calculated to do away with that intense hatred of evil which is necessary to all who wish to live aright. As for the opinions upon most matters of importance expressed in the novels, he is quite unable to classify them.

He began by trying to arrange them in schools, and, after reading five novels by different authors, he had already formed five distinct schools. But on failing to light upon any one set of opinions which was exactly like another, he has given up the attempt in despair. He thinks of the days of St. Thomas, when educated men were trained to think consecutively. Then, indeed, there were such things as real schools of thought, which took up and improved the speculations of others, and, year by year, kept adding fresh grandeur to the intellectual edifice they were erecting; but here, in these ingenious narratives, the chosen vehicles of modern thought, he finds only kaleidoscopic fragments suddenly brought together to produce some transient effect. He sees how the spoils of time, the scattered treasures of history, language

and philosophy, are used to advantage by men who have inherited them with so little trouble. He wonders, too, at the extraordinary genius of some of these little creators who are so busy with the propagation of ideas which are new and surprising to himself. He asks why Sir Walter Scott is so dissatisfied with the present and so despairingly enamoured of the past; why Thackeray, without any hope of converting his readers, is at such pains to show them that their whole life is an imposture; and how Sir Walter Besant arrives at the conclusion that men would be more virtuous if there were fewer churches and more music and dancing. He is especially astounded to find such a charming and able writer as George Eliot attempting to prove that ethics have no foundation, nobility no purpose, and sublimity and beauty no archetype. Finally, in perplexity and disappointment, he gives up his course of novel-reading and goes for consolation to the philosophy and the science of our century. There we will leave him to glean what information he can.

And now let us make a fair exchange by transplanting a fairly-educated man of our own century into a state of things resembling that of the thirteenth century in England. We will suppose him to be one who has had a good average non-technical education, and who passes for a man of good general information, while his one great aim, in his new surroundings, is to introduce as much as he can of nineteenth century improvements. He has no elementary science manuals, no encyclopædias, and no tools or appliances of any sort. He depends entirely upon his memory, and at first he thinks that his task will be quite an easy one, he seems to have such very clear ideas about steamships, locomotives, atomic theories, higher mathematics and surgery. But when he begins to put down his ideas on paper, with a view to an early demonstration, he begins to realize that he has no thorough knowledge of anything. He knows really nothing about the inner working of the dynamo; he fails to give a clear account of the action of the piston-rod in a steam-engine; his philosophy is actually thought to be "behind the times," and his science consists of a vast array of interesting facts upon which many a wise head will have to ponder before anything can be made of them. He has quite given up hoping to see steamships or railways introduced in his lifetime, though he has, no doubt, set his new contemporaries on the track of many new discoveries, and hastened on many an invention by several generations. How he wishes he had spent his time in mastering some branch of science instead of spending his time in promiscuous reading! What would he not give to have with him the science text-books of his school-days, nay, even his chimney-piece clock, or his children's toy locomo-

tive! There is one thing, however, which he can do, and do well, and that is tell a good story. His auditors are wonder-struck at the number and ingenuity of the plots which he remembers from his recent novel-reading, and his reputation as a strolling story-teller is far higher than his credit as an inventor.

But, to have done with parables and impossible predicaments, it does, indeed, seem a strange thing that when, with a little mental effort, there is so much enjoyment to be got from science and history, a large proportion of readers are found who spend all their spare hours in studying a long and elaborate account of a set of persons who never existed. Even if the matter be regarded from the point of view of the pleasure derived from the occupation, it may well be questioned whether the sum total of enjoyment that comes from reading, say an interesting biography or a book of travels, is not really greater than that to be got from a novel. In the former case it may be true that the actual present enjoyment is not so great, but then the after-pleasures of memory more than compensate for this defect; whereas, the novel, which is written primarily for present amusement, commonly leaves behind it a very small residuum of instruction or reflective pleasure. A writer in "The Nineteenth Century,"[1] treating of this subject, says: "Again, let it be said that if novel-reading is the surest, as it is the easiest, means of intellectual recreation, there is no cause to interfere with or discourage it; but the true hedonist—he whose avowed aim is pleasure—will find it to his profit to consider whether he is getting good value for the time spent in it, whether he is not neglecting other sources of delight not less sure and more enduring. If he applies to novels an infallible test of the value of any book—is it worth reading, note-book and pencil in hand?—he will be surprised how few, how very few works of fiction stand the proof. That this test is infallible rests on the well-known fact that pleasure consists not in the present, which is fleeting, but in anticipation and retrospect. Memory is treacherous and requires refreshing, and unless the recollection of what is read is ensured by notes, reading is a task as fruitless as that of the daughters of Danaus; it serves to spend our limited capital in time without enriching the ever-diminishing store of future."

A not uncommon result produced by the continual reading of novels is a sort of mental dyspepsia, which renders the patient incapable of any real intellectual enjoyment whatsoever. He is in the condition corresponding to that of an injudicious epicure who has been trying to live upon peaches and cream with iced drinks, and has become unable to appreciate the flavor of ordinary whole-

[1] June, 1893, *The Craving for Fiction.* By Herbert Maxwell.

some food. It would almost seem that the public at large is beginning to suffer from this complaint, if we are to judge by the vast quantity of fiction brought out by weekly and monthly magazines in the form of short stories easily digested and "swiftly gorgeable." The reading of such stories, which ought only to be performed in the resting hours of the day, requires but a minimum of mental effort, and the pleasure which they afford is not of a high quality. The higher forms of æsthetic enjoyment exercise the mind while they delight it. The enjoyment of a great picture, a great poem, or even of a great novel, is not merely passive. The intellect and the imagination of the reader or beholder must co-operate largely with the artist in order to produce the effect desired. It does not require great experience to prove this. How many men of good literary appreciation have not been occasionally not a little disappointed upon reading some play of Shakespeare for the first time? A second reading, however, has given them greater pleasure, and a third still more, and so their sympathy with their author grows. Each new perusal draws forth a flood of light from some passage that was meaningless before, for it may be that their memory has since gathered some new experience, some new impression from life which serves as a key to unlock the poet's meaning. Meanwhile they find that the power of their own imagination to act upon small suggestions is growing, and that a short phrase is often enough to set in movement a whole train of thought which it is far sweeter to follow out than the minute analysis of the philosophic novelist. In art the half is greater than the whole, and "Le secret d'ennuyer est de tout dire." The remaining half it is the proper task of the imagination to supply. To give the first suggestion is the work of genius; the sympathetic following out of that suggestion belongs to docility and patient toil. There are chords in our heart which have long remained untouched and rigid until the master-hand of some great poet or artist has made them vibrate, but the sweetness of their first vibration has often to be bought at the expense of pain and effort. Now, in the case of a very large proportion of our present popular novels, no such effort is made, nor is it, indeed, necessary, as the readers have all their thinking done for them. They may, perhaps, close their book with a flattering sense of deep thinking done, but they soon find that their mind is not a whit more vigorous than it was before. It has not been exercised, and must suffer the consequences of want of exercise, which are weakness and dyspepsia.

It is, of course, true that many forms of intellectual enjoyment are impossible to those who have not had a special preliminary training. It is, as a rule, only the trained musician who can fully

appreciate the best work of the great composers, and only an artist or a practiced connoisseur who can perceive the subtler beauties of a great work of art. But it is far from true to say that, outside the region of fiction, there is not open to everyone who can read intelligently a vast store-house of entertainment for the mind, which sharpens the faculties whilst it gives them pleasure. It requires no special training beyond that ordinary mental discipline which every man should exercise upon himself, in order to appreciate Shakespeare, yet with how many omnivorous readers is Shakespeare but a name? Those who do read him appreciatively probably find that they owe more to him than they do to all the novels that they have ever read; nor is this to the detriment of the novels, for the golden ore which many of them contain is more readily perceived and better appreciated by such as are familiar with the higher work of a great poet. When a play of Shakespeare has been once understood, the memory of it may be easily recalled by a short reading which will always give new light and pleasure, while the repetition of a novel is a labor which not very many readers think it worth their while to face, thereby giving their estimate of the value of what they read. The present writer was once told by a French priest who had not much time for reading, that his chief delight in leisure hours was in Shakespeare and the Douay Bible, and that he had come to regard other books as vanity—a state of mind to be envied by those of us who are oppressed by the thought of the multitude of books which we ought, but shall never be able to read.

We have already remarked that there is some matter for wonder in the fact that novels are so abundant in an age which makes so much of facts. In our days the most minute facts are hunted out, verified and recorded for the sake of some future utility which their investigator will often never see. It is for the sake of facts that the tombs of Egypt are violated and the buried cities of Asia are dug up by the learned of Europe and America. It is to establish facts, often of unimportant bearing, that commentators exhaust their logic and critics their sarcasm. The war-correspondent who dies on the battle-field and the explorer who perishes of cold in the arctic snows are both, in their different ways, martyrs to their zeal for facts. And then there is the bloodless martyrdom of that army of willing drudges who find out and arrange the materials for future history which lie buried in the record office. They love their labor as martyrs love their cross, for to them facts are precious for their own sake and apart from the future use which may be made of them.

It is with reason that facts are valued in our own day, for by the patient study of them whole sciences have been built up, and

many of the outer aspects of our civilization entirely transformed. Yet side by side with this persistent energy in fact-collecting there is a wide-spread and growing activity in the making and reading of fiction. This is all the more surprising when we consider what power the study of facts, and often their mere relation, can exercise over the intellect and imagination. Witness the enthusiasm of some young learner, perhaps one whose school course is considered to have been thrown away, and who has just begun some branch of study for which he really has a taste. He seems to have found somewhere a new memory and a new understanding, and his only complaint is that time goes by too quickly for him to stock his all-retaining mind to within any nearness of its capacity. He never suffers from *ennui*, that plague of omnivorous novel-readers. Very soon his favorite study, whether it be architecture or botany, or medicine or chemistry, will give him an interest which he never had before in the things he sees and hears of every day. His powers of observation are quickened and his capacity for enjoyment greatly enlarged. "Those who have not tried for themselves," says Sir John Lubbock, "can hardly imagine how much science adds to the interest and variety of life. It is altogether a mistake to regard it as dry, difficult or prosaic; much of it is as easy as it is interesting. In endless aspects science is as wonderful and interesting as a fairy-tale."

If science possesses such attractions for the human mind, it would seem that history—and by history we mean history in its most general sense as the record of human action—should be a source of still greater delight. That such is the case would seem to follow from the well-known sayings, "The proper study of mankind is man," and "Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto."[1] As a matter of fact, however, the claims of history over fiction as a source of healthful instruction, to say nothing of amusement, are not everywhere allowed. Fielding says somewhere that nothing is true in history except the names and dates, whereas in fiction everything is true except the names and dates, and we might safely allow that there is much truth in this paradox, especially in the first part of it, when we think of how much invention, even now, passes for history, and that so much history has to be re-written. As a matter of fact imagination plays an important part in the writing of all history that is not a bare chronicle of events, and if a historian has no further equipment for his task than the dry facts which he finds in his documents he will, at best, be able to tell only half truths. It is worse still if his

[1] "I am a man, and I think that all things human are my concern." (Terence, *Hautontimorumen*, as Act i., sc. 1, l. 25.)

imagination is wayward and untruthful, for he will give a false coloring to all the actions which he describes. Now it is this power of true coloring, this supplying the record of human feelings and human passions, which are the most valuable part of history and which mere chronicles can never give, that forms the chief qualification of a historian. If he has it in a high degree his work will be not only instructive but intensely interesting. It will have all the interest of a romance, with the additional advantage of being true. "Oh! it reads like a novel," is considered to be somewhat doubtful praise of an historical work; but that is because historians so often use their imagination to a wrong purpose.

It is easier to say what might be than what is, and consequently the inventive imagination is a commoner gift than the historic. Both are, or ought to be, limited by the great facts of human nature, but the former has a far wider scope, for, with this restriction, it is free to travel about the whole world of possibilities. It is, moreover, less accountable for its vagaries, since, when it goes wrong, it is not easily convicted on the testimony of recorded facts, while the reading public, on receipt of a good round allowance of sensation, are apt to be indulgent critics. More pocket-money, too, is granted to the inventive imagination, and history has suffered thereby, for many owners of the historic variety have had it converted into the more remunerative kind. What opportunities in our huge Anglo-Saxon reading world for a novelist who knows the measure of his public, and fits it to a nicety with such a production as "Trilby."

We have just said that a novel must conform to the great facts of human nature, and in so far as it does so it is truthful and not fictitious. Its generalities and its relations are true, while its details are false, and this was what Fielding meant when he stated the paradox which we have mentioned above. The truth of a novel, like the truth of all works of art, is, in one respect, similar to the truth of physical science. In both cases ideal circumstances have to be invented in order to state and illustrate the great laws of nature. Before we can understand the planetary theory we have to be told that the planets move in elliptical orbits, whereas no real planet has ever been suspected of doing so; the whole truth being that all planets *would* do so if there were no such facts as perturbation, proper motion of the sun, resistance of the medium traversed, and other phenomena known to astronomers. Again, Newton's first law, which supposes that bodies are capable of rest or of movement in a straight line, is none the less true in spite of its being improbable that any body ever fulfilled either condition. What the philosopher meant was that there are forces in nature which would produce the effects stated if left to themselves.

It is in much the same way that a novel shows us how the laws that govern human action *would* act in given circumstances. The persons and conditions are fictitious, but the laws which they illustrate are true. In the circumstances of real life the character of a man seldom has the opportunity of displaying itself in its fulness. Many a possible hero lives unnoticed in real life, because there is never an occasion to call his heroism into play. In a novel, on the contrary, which is a drama with the action described instead of performed, the various *personæ* have the circumstances exactly so arranged that their characters shall be clearly exhibited and adequately worked out. This is the way in which the novelist holds the mirror up to nature. He eliminates all the dull details of everyday life, and all things that interfere with the harmonious working out of the plot, and by so doing he gives opportunity for the study of mankind in an isolated medium. He does for his characters what Newton did for his moving body when he made a mental abstraction of all that could interfere with its free movement in a straight line. This process of elimination is necessary in the physical sciences not only for merely theoretic knowledge, but for theory as a necessary step to practice. A student of practical gunnery, for instance, must begin with a knowledge of the properties of the parabola. But what, may be asked, is the object of such a process in a novel? Why should men be studied in a medium in which they do not naturally exist? For no one was ever enabled to deal better with his fellow-men in real life by studying their behavior in a novel. The answer to this question which has sometimes, we imagine, been asked in all seriousness, is that a novel, any more than a drama, is not intended to give us a knowledge of mankind for practical purposes, but merely for purposes of contemplation and to satisfy our æsthetic requirements. The study of character under ideal conditions could never become a science with any practical application, for no one pretends to know enough of the principles of human conduct to treat of them with anything like the accuracy of a scientific treatise. Hence, while the ideal projectile greatly promotes our knowledge of the behavior of a real shrapnel shell, our contemplation of ideal men helps us very little towards a practical knowledge of the world.

To repeat, in other words, what we have just said, the interest of historical works, and the interest of novels, depends upon the interest of the human action that is in them. The reason why novels are more popular reading than books of history is, that the latter, though having the advantage of telling what really happened, are commonly produced without much help from the imagination which alone can fill in all the details which go to make up a human action. Hence, to quote again the words of Mr.

Herbert Maxwell: "People like their history as they do their bread-and-butter—in thin slices. Perhaps it is the fault of historians, but there can be no doubt they are not in it with the novelists."

Let us now regard this interest in human character and action from another point of view. In a novel we are introduced to new acquaintances whom it is often very desirable to know. Who is not proud of his acquaintance with Sam Weller and Mr. Micawber, to say nothing of more heroic personalities? In many respects we often have a better knowledge of these phantom friends than we have of many of our nearest and dearest in real life. Their characters are interesting because they are so completely unveiled, whereas the actual men and women whom we see every day are very chary of showing us what they really are. When a man is really known he becomes interesting, even though his character is of a very ordinary type. He will always have some individualities with a charm of their own. But the difficulty in real life, strange as it may seem, is ever to get to know anybody. Many people do not know their fathers and mothers, though they see them every day; and, oftener still, parents do not know their children. In a novel complete acquaintance with most interesting people is formed in a few hours, and their company is so entertaining that it makes us waste many an hour that had been better employed somewhere else. We sometimes hear it said that there is a large class of writers who are able to produce only one successful novel. The reason why their *opus magnum* is interesting is, that they have revealed their own personality in the work, and so provided us with a study that is true to life, and therefore a source of delight. Their other works are hard and uninteresting, for their imagination cannot safely fly beyond their own personality or enter into the depths of any other soul but their own. An imagination like that of Nathaniel Hawthorne, by a wonderful sympathy with the feelings and passions of others, will act upon the very smallest suggestions, and out of the most limited experience of life create such a character as that of Pearl in "The Scarlet Letter." But such a gift is rare.

If, then, the writer of history desires to compete with the novelist in providing us with entertaining reading, he must use the novelist's arts in presenting us with living characters with whom it is desirable to become acquainted. If, for instance, he wishes to interest us in King Alfred the Great, he must not be content, as most historians are, with laboriously collecting King Alfred's dry bones for our inspection, nor think that his task is done when he has put together the complete skeleton. His chief work yet remains to be done, for he must clothe the skeleton with flesh and

blood and inspire it with the breath of human life. His task is a harder one than that of the novelist, since we do not want Alfred as he might have been, but Alfred as he was; that is to say, the picture of him must be in complete accord with all that is said of him in the chronicles of his early biographers.

There are, in our days, many students, as well as writers, of history; more now, probably, than there have ever been before. Novelists themselves are careful to store their minds with facts before they compose their stories. Moreover, there are a vast number of excellent historical books in existence, not only such as are intended for the special student, but also such as are suited to the general reader. Many of this latter class, whether they be in the form of biographies or of histories, in the more common acceptation of the term, leave nothing to be desired in the attractive way in which they are written. Would that they were better known. Perhaps, in some cases, the exclusive use of dull text-books has gone some way towards creating a dislike for history in any shape or form. At all events, though historical students can boast of a large inner circle, their outer circle among the general public is small when compared with the number of those who follow after fiction.

Here we may touch upon a point which is of special interest to Catholics. What a store of entertaining literature making for edification would be produced if the historians of saints' lives made a better use of their imagination upon the facts at their disposal? Often enough some great saint, endowed during life with an irresistible charm of manner, who had the highest natural gifts, purified and made still more wonderful by grace, is misrepresented as a dry bundle of virtues. All that was human in him has been eliminated, whereas all the power and all the attractiveness of a saint is in the intenseness of his elevated humanity. The painters of saints' pictures, too, are often as calumnious in their representations as their biographers, and, if we are to believe what they depict, many of God's saints were what are known in the world as "frumps"—men we should not look forward to meeting in heaven. Thus is truth made to look like falsehood!

In spite of all that has been said in favor of the novel as a means of giving pleasure, the fact yet remains, as we have explained in an earlier part of this paper, that the reader of history has the advantage of the reader of romance. However delightful they may be, there are few novels which can give the mind that solid and lasting satisfaction that comes of being instructed and invigorated. Too often works of fiction are like saccharine, which gives sweetness, but not nourishment. Of course this is not the case with all novels, for many of them, written with an object, have been

the means of ridding the world of some crying abuse or of setting on foot some necessary reform. Others, again, have been written to edify, and, for aught we know, have worked great spiritual good. But perhaps the writers of religious novels would have been glad to convey their message in some other form than that of a romance, if only they had any hope of being read.

Here it may be well to deal with the contention often brought forward that novels are, *par excellence*, the literature of our day—the principal vehicles of modern thought, and that, therefore, if we wish to know the mind of our times we must read a great deal of current fiction. This contention is, undoubtedly, to a large extent, valid. A very large portion of our later nineteenth century intellect has been expended upon the novel, whether in producing or assimilating it, and, consequently, an assiduous student of contemporary fiction is furnished with a large set of modern ideas. But are all such ideas worth assimilating? Is the best thought of our times to be found in the novel? If so, we might well be content with reading no other form of modern literature. But we find, as a matter of fact, that nearly all those thinkers who, for good or for ill, have had most influence upon our times, have not chosen to convey their ideas through the medium of the novel. Mill, Darwin, Herbert Spencer, and, among Catholic writers, Newman, Ward, Hecker and Brownson, are none of them known as novelists. It is true that Newman produced one or two novels, but they have not added materially to his reputation. It is perfectly true that in many modern novels, especially in more recent ones, there is a great deal of religion, philosophy, political economy and art criticism; and such works are intended by the authors, if not by the readers, mainly for instruction. But, after all, the thought that is in them is of a fragmentary nature, and generally at second-hand. We all like a little philosophy for the sake of recreation and quiet mental exercise, and we find it ready to hand in the instructive novel. But we do not take the instruction too seriously, and when we want really nutritious diet we go to seek it somewhere else.

It will happen, however, that a few—a very few—novelists of the highest rank, such as Scott or Dickens, men entirely devoid of priggery, and whose avowed purpose is to provide wholesome amusement, will take rank upon a level not far removed from the philosophers and thinkers of our time, for, without any special effort to do so, they have succeeded in reflecting in a marked degree the mind and temper of their generation. Not that there is any formal philosophy or assumption of the teacher's *rôle* in their works, but the whole tone of their writings is pervaded by what is most characteristic of the spirit of the times. It is the fate of most

writers of books to be soon forgotten, and, when a generation has been dead for a single century, its mind and thought are carried down to posterity by only a few representative voices. It cannot be otherwise when the store of books that deserve to live is steadily if slowly increasing, while the daily output of perishable literature is also tending to grow more rapidly. Posterity, in its desire to know the thoughts and the mental diversions of its forefathers, will have no time to consider that heterogeneous mass of our current fiction which has no sufficiently distinct or representative character to warrant its claim to travel down the highway of time. Our grandsons yet unborn will choose only the best of what has been handed down to them, and their judgment of what is best will probably be not far wide of the mark. It will be well if we, too, in our choice of books, can in some way anticipate that judgment. They will have made up their minds that by far the larger part of our hastily conceived and often merely trifling novels will not greatly help them in building up their conception of the mind of their forefathers; and we, too, in due proportion, may well afford to make a clean sweep of a vast deal of literature which teaches us little more of our own times than it does of the days of Sardanapalus.

After all that has been said, it may naturally be asked what amount of novel-reading is good for a man, or whether it is advisable to forego the practice of reading fiction altogether? It is, perhaps, sufficiently clear to the reader that the present writer has not been all his life a total abstainer from novels, so that he cannot claim any of the advantages which such an abstinence might entail. In fact, he himself is a believer in a moderate indulgence in novel-reading. Novels are the sweets of literature, and, fortunately, not all of them are like saccharine—entirely innutritious. In them, besides finding helpful recreation, we may learn many things which are less easily learned in other books. Through them, in large measure, comes down to us the rich inheritance of stately English prose. They awaken or invigorate our imagination and bring before us many forms of feeling and sentiment which we may not have met with in real life. Nor are they without their didactic value; for, supposing that our mind has been previously educated with more solid instruction, the fragments of history, philosophy and science which we meet with in novels will find their right place in our memory and usefully survive. But no one who has any care for the solid improvement of his mind can afford to let novels take the place of more serious reading. Each one will have to make his own selection, which will vary according to his own character and circumstances, and it will be well for him to make a rule of reading less rather than more. In the

case of fiction, as in all other luxuries, total abstinence is far better than excess. A man who reads no novels, but devotes his leisure to more solid reading, is far wiser and happier than he who reads nothing else but novels. The indiscriminate reader of fiction, along with the danger of mental enervation, may incur very serious risks to both faith and morals.

JAMES KENDAL, S.J.

ST. BRUNO'S COLLEGE, St. Asaph.

THE LAND OF RECURRING FAMINES.

INDIA is so remote from the rest of the world, by distance as well as by the wall of isolation which English jealousy has thrown around it, that its vast tragedies are enacted comparatively unobserved. The policy of seclusion which is traditional with the system called government there is generally successful in hiding the truth until danger has come to a head, and then it is too late to have effective help rendered by the outside world. A gross injustice to humanity at large is thus perpetrated by those responsible for the system. We here, in this land of ever-abounding harvests, would be only too ready to reach out a hand to our suffering brothers, the too patient Hindoos, could we but have had warning that it would be needed. Yet it is questionable if we could, by our generosity, help to save a single life in India, so peculiar are the conditions which have grown up in that vast and diversified empire under the old race of native princes and under their successors, the East India Company, and, subsequently, the British Government.

To the question, What is the cause of famine? the logical answer would seem to be, Scarcity of food. Is it not strange, this being so, to learn, that while people die by the million in India, there is food enough in the country to feed all? No one need doubt that such is actually the case. The fact is admitted by the governmental reports. The bountiful hand of Providence has given abundance of food, even in times of the worst scarcity, to feed all the people. It is the heartless mismanagement of the store by selfish man that causes his fellows to perish from hunger. The speculators in human agony buy up the food supplies whenever the prospects of the harvest appear favorable to their cold-

blooded designs, and keep them locked up until the season of tension sets in. It is the want of money to purchase the food when it becomes dear which causes the people to perish. The government will not interfere with the operations of the grain monopolists, nor will they forbid the export of food supplies to foreign countries, for this would be contrary to all sound free-trade and economical policy. Hence it would be idle to pour grain from outside upon the Indian people. It would never be suffered to reach their hands. What they want is money—money to satisfy the speculators in famine—the money which the government has drained from them to the last farthing in pursuance of the orthodox system of political economy, while, with the absolute certainty of famine before the country, it has allowed the grain to be sent away to other lands or locked up in granaries for the purpose of making gold for the vampire operators.

When the people of the United States are invited to subscribe toward the establishment of a permanent anti-famine fund in India, it is time to make some inquiry into the facts of the case. The request is quite different from a mere appeal for temporary assistance in a crisis of unforeseen and non-preventible calamity. When we have examined into the circumstances we shall see that it would be quite as reasonable to request us to establish a fund for the liquidation of the British National Debt.

The first fact to be taken into account, in the examination of this question, is the well-established regularity of periods of scarcity. It seems to be the result of a physical law, operating with the steadiness of an automatic instrument. The periods of drought, of greater or lesser severity, are known to occur nine times in every century. Nearly a hundred years ago the British officer who became the Duke of Wellington brought this fact before the home government in the course of recommendations regarding the administration of the country. Every decade since they were penned has strengthened the affirmation. Will anyone venture to say that it was not the absolute duty of the government to provide against the danger by the establishment of a famine fund and the provision of relief works? The resources of the country were taken over not merely to feed and pay the army of occupation and the government officials, but for the maintenance and protection of the people. In a natural state of things, the latter object should take precedence of the other; but in the eyes of all conquerors this ethical order is reversed, and the selfish interests of the intruder become at all times the first and the paramount consideration.

Since the days of Edmund Burke only one voice has been raised effectively in the British Parliament in favor of the moral

view in the government of India. The splendid eloquence of the late John Bright again and again urged the plea that the only justification for England's presence in India was the advancement of the interests of the Indian people. But he pleaded to hearts of adamant and faces of brass.

In point of population the Indian Empire ranks next to China. By the last census it showed a total of about two hundred and seventy millions; to-day it must contain close on three hundred millions. Great as this number is, it does not at all represent overcrowding in any locality, so vast is the extent of territory covered by the British flag. There are millions on millions of acres of reclaimable land, especially alongside the fertile alluvial valleys of the Ganges and the Brahmapootra, so that if the population were doubled and the administration of the country what it ought to be, intended for the good and not the mere plunder and subjection of the people, there need be no fear of a congestion of humanity in India for many a century. Nature, too, as in all tropical countries, is more than kindly. With the most primitive forms of cultivation, the soil in many places readily yields two crops in the year, in some places three. It is only when the monsoon fails and the land becomes parched for want of moisture, that the yield fails to meet the people's needs; and even in those periods the drought is never general.

Agriculture being the main reliance of this enormous population, their fortunes naturally fluctuate with the results of the seasons and the economic laws of the outside world. To this condition the ancient governments adjusted themselves. Not so the British. Wherever their rule extends they have supplanted the payment in kind, in a proportion of the produce, by a fixed assessment, payable in gold, and on the very day on which they fix it to fall due.

The land tax is the great source of revenue in India. It is the one whose pressure is felt universally by the land-holding class—that is to say, about one-half the population. Next in burden comes the salt tax. This eats into the vitals of all—for salt is an absolute necessity of life. The poorest classes must have it in larger quantities than the wealthier, because they never eat animal food, and salt then becomes essential to maintain the proper constituents of the blood. The purchase of salt absorbs about one-sixth of the income of a laborer's family—and nine-tenths of the price of the article go into the coffers of the government as duty. Salt can be had in abundance in the country for the making, but its manufacture has been placed under conditions and restrictions identical with those which regulate the production of alcoholic spirits. The third source on which the government in India relies is the manufacture of opium. A revenue of from thirty to

forty millions of dollars per annum is derived from the monopoly leased out for the production of that deadly drug.

When speaking of money in connection with India, it is well to premise that the values there bear no proportion to those associated with money here. A laborer in India can be hired for a few cents a day; half a dollar would maintain a whole family, so low are the prices of food, usually for a week. Hence when we say that the revenue raised by the government for its purposes annually amounts to about three hundred millions of dollars, the mind may dimly grasp what an enormous proportion of the whole monetary wealth of the country is annually drained into the coffers of her foreign rulers. This difference in values between East and West should never be lost sight of in the discussion of questions involving fiscal issues. One dollar a month, according to Mr. Julian Hawthorne, would maintain an adult Hindoo laborer. It would take, at the lowest scale of living, at least twenty times that amount to support and lodge and clothe the poorest class of laborer in the United States. Taking this difference as a haphazard guide, we may form some remote conception of what such a sum as three hundred million dollars taxation means to the people of India, and how much more for luxurious living an army officer on six thousand dollars a year may have in that country than in England, where his pay in the same grade, according to the War Office scale, would be only about half that amount, while his cost of living would be little less than what it would be in the United States.

It is startling to think of the representative of any system of government, no matter how absolute, coming upon the land of a farmer, casting his eye over the growing crop, estimating its probable yield, and then turning to the tiller of the soil and saying: "The crops on this land will probably fetch twenty dollars an acre; you have to pay half that amount for every acre on the last day of August (say), else I will send men to seize the whole and sell it." Yet this is the very thing that is done all over India as regularly as the Ganges rises and falls, every year. Nor will it do to pay the tribute in bills; nothing but gold will be accepted. The process by which the thing is effected varies; in some states the land is leased to the zemindars; in others to the village communities; but the end is attained, no matter what the agency by which it is accomplished. Thus at one fell swoop half the legitimate income of the land cultivator is appropriated by his masters. Then comes the tax on salt—salt, without which, as we have explained, life cannot be maintained, as the human blood would turn into water and the whole frame collapse from inanition. This sweeps away another sixth of the farmer's income, leaving him but about

forty per cent. of his gross earnings to meet all the other expenses of his household. By indirect taxation he loses, probably, another tenth on this, in the prices he pays for imported implements and clothing, on which more or less heavy duties are levied; so that, when all demands have been satisfied, the amount available for the farmer's own purposes can hardly exceed thirty per cent. of the produce of his fields. More than two-thirds of the income of every Indian cultivator is the price he pays for the privilege of English government.

Here is a position which at once removes any uncertainty one may entertain as to the causes of the recurrent famines. In seasons of scarcity there is nothing between the people and destruction; all their resources have been swept away, and when any question is raised about the equity of the system, the answer is forthcoming that under the rule of the native princes, prior to the taking over of the territory of the Anglo-Indian government, the cultivator had to pay a much larger proportion of his earnings to the ruler. This may be so in certain states, but then the assessment was on the crops, and not an *ad valorem* money levy, payable whether the harvest justified the estimate or not. This is a difference of the widest possible character.

The statement that in provinces under native rule the assessment, or rent, is higher than in those governed by the people at Calcutta, while strictly true in some cases, must be taken with qualifications. Jeypore is one of those places, the centre of the present disturbed region. It was visited by Sir James Caird fourteen years ago, and he found that, while the assessment was higher, the people appeared to be in no worse condition than those in British India. They possess an enormous advantage, indeed, over these, for the laws of the state protect them against the second great plague of British India—that is, the Bunyia, or money-lender. Then land in Jeypore can never be sold out by him or to him. Hence the cultivator has absolute security in his holding. The Bunyia in all places outside the native states is, next to the the British over-lord, the great vampire of the peninsula. He is a necessity of the situation created by the English system of payment in coin. In times of scarcity he is the only one who has coin, and he is the arbiter of life and death. In Ireland we see the Bunyia reproduced in the gombeen-man, but he is far more of an institution in British India, and has produced there a state of affairs as desperate as that which prevailed in old Rome and Latium before the passage of the agrarian laws, when the people who got into the money-lender's debt became, in case of inability to pay at the stipulated time, his slaves, to be worked in his service or sold in the Forum, according to his good-will and pleasure.

Every latitude has been given the Bunyia in British India, in pursuance of that sacred fetish of political economists, freedom of contract. He can charge what he pleases as interest, and as a result of this merciless system the chattels of the cultivator, and after awhile the land, passes into his possession in hundreds of thousands of cases.

An example is quoted by Sir James Caird, one of the greatest authorities on economical subjects connected with agriculture. He traversed the greater part of India after the great famine of 1876–77, and inquired most minutely into the social situation of the cultivators. In the Deccan he found in one "talook"—that is, a district in charge of a single native landlord or collector—out of its 970 small holders only 139 were in full possession of their land; the remainder were wholly or partially mortgaged, in regard to their crops, by a class of intermediaries called sowcars, who are another variety of the regular Bunyia, and who charge the cultivators from 12 to 36 per cent. on the money they advance on the security of the growing crops. After the Bunyia and the sowcar comes the law. It seems to be a matter of course to appeal to the law in every case of money-borrowing, and here the heavy hand of the Anglo-Indian government is again felt. There is an excessive duty on stamps. Ten per cent. of the whole amount of the sum at issue goes for stamps, 8 for lawyers' services, and 7 for "miscellaneous" charges. After wasting 25 per cent. of the whole claim, the decree is generally left without execution, for there would be no profit in levying a distress for it. Not more than twenty decrees out of every hundred are followed by distraint, by reason of a case of *de bonis non*, or because there is no saleable interest in the land or no buyers to be found. This particular "talook," when examined by Sir James Caird, was so submerged in debt to the sowcars that the product of its harvest for many years would not suffice to free it, and the sowcars would willingly accept a compromise on the basis of half their claim, if they could only get it. It may be said that a similar state of affairs prevails throughout the greater part of British India. In the wake of the tax-collector follow the money-lender and the lawyer, and when all these have had their pound of flesh, a few handfuls of rice a day, in the more fortunate seasons, is the portion of the tillers of the soil in millions upon millions of cases.

Very little does the outside world know of the nature and extent of the colossal pathos which underlies this perpetual procession of imperial and legal underlings and their unhappy victims. It is a profound ever-recurring human tragedy acted on the vastest theatre, where the actors are all in earnest and everything is as real as the spring of the jungle tiger. Here, indeed, do we

see in operation the frightful machinery of the inevitable, and gain a glimpse of the reasons for the fatalism of the orientals. Here is the birthplace of the *ananké* of the Greek belief, the iron that entered into the souls of the Hindoo and Egyptian millions ages ago, even before they were trodden under the steeds of Cambyses and Sesostris and given over in millions to merciless task-masters. In a land of splendor and beauty beyond the power of imagination, this hideous drama of humanity goes on century after century, without one ray of hope of cessation to the doomed people. It was so in the days of Æschylus; it is so in the days of Rudyard Kipling and Tommy Atkins.

One thing has been ascertained: that, with the physical conditions which prevail throughout the peninsula famine is, and must be for long, a thing of regular recurrence. This has been demonstrated by a long series of careful observations. At least nine times in a century there must be, in the nature of things—the fluctuations in the monsoon, the devastations of floods and droughts, and other physical conditions—a failure of the harvest, partial or widespread. So far back as the days of Wellington, and even earlier, the government was made fully aware of this fact. Sir John Strachey computed the sum required to meet this periodical misfortune at seven and a half million dollars a year—a mere trifle when we consider the immense revenues drawn from the people affected. Again and again has the formation of a famine fund been pressed by humane administrators on the Calcutta and the London governments. Spasmodic attempts to act on the advice have been made, it is true, but it has been almost invariably found, whenever the state of the Indian budget afforded a balance to set aside for the nucleus of a famine fund, that engineering works, or irrigation projects, or the cost of some "little war" presented a prior claim. It may be hard to credit, but it is nevertheless true, that the cost of every military enterprise in the East is saddled upon the Indian people; and even the expense of moving the Indian troops to Cyprus was charged upon the same exchequer by the cynical Prime Minister, Lord Beaconsfield, at the time he desired to impress upon Russia the richness and variety of resources of the British Empire when the Muscovite troops were encamped within cannon-shot of Constantinople. Later on the Indian exchequer was called upon to defray a proportion, if not the whole, of the cost of the expedition against King Theebau which resulted in the annexation of Burmah, on the ground that it was from India that the troops started for the Irrawaddy. On what principle of equity these charges could be justified it is difficult to imagine. Undertakings of imperial aggrandizement are matters of high policy, conceived and mapped out in

Downing street, as a rule. To the people of India, as well as to the semi-independent rulers of India, they bring not a scintilla of either material benefit or sentimental renown.

Little is really known, as we have said, of the periodical sufferings of this unhappy Eastern people. Even the people under whose rule they wither and sink have but an imperfect knowledge of the numbers who fall in skeleton heaps, in the remoter districts, when the blight of the famine is over the land. Many steal away to die in some obscure nook or the depths of the trackless jungle. The returns of the deaths given by the government officials are merely guess-work.

Is it a matter of interest, indeed, to the government whether these people live or die? We are entitled to ask this startling question by reason of the facts we find stated by authorities who certainly have no reason to be suspected of animus against British rule. We must bear in mind the numerical immensity of the native population in India. Every fresh census shows this population to be increasing at a ratio which suggests a curious question as to the ability of the soil to maintain them, unless the process of land reclamation be undertaken on a vastly more extended scale than has been the practice down to the present. The famines recurring every decade with deadly regularity do more than kill the millions who succumb. They leave their awful impress upon the miserable frames of many more millions of survivors, in such a way as precludes all possibility of recuperation. Vast numbers of the people, in different territories, corresponding with the radii of the various famines, thus become physically deteriorated, and their posterity, as a natural result, physical degenerates besides. People of this kind are not only feeble in body but spiritless in temperament. They are only fit to be slaves and drudges, and it is of such a kind that a great proportion of the Indian population consists. When famine makes its appearance, and with it the tax-collector and the gombeen-man, despair seizes the wretched people. Mutely they meet the long-expected and inevitable; they have no energy to cry out or strike in blind rage at their oppressors, but many anticipate death by poison or steel or wave. The number of suicides in India is past knowledge and past computation.

Is it, then, Malthusianism which we behold in practice in India? The question is suggested by the hard and unemotional statements of the British Commissioner, Sir James Caird. His exegesis of the different famines of this century leaves a distinct impression that in several of them the people were left to perish deliberately; he makes the horrible charge in specific terms, indeed, in connection with more than one of them. He is framing

no indictment against anybody; he is merely reciting bald facts. In a couple of cases there were genuine attempts to avert suffering, but in the far greater number there was a cynical indifference to human life that reflects no credit on British Christianity.

Until the modern school of political economists appeared on the scene, one of the first things done by a government, when it had been definitely ascertained that the harvest had been so deficient as to threaten famine, was to prohibit the exportation of grain from the country threatened. The next was to set about buying corn from abroad to meet the deficiency. These two things were done in the earlier parts of the century, when there was famine in Bombay, Madras, and other parts of Northern India. Yet though the government bestirred itself actively, not one-twentieth part of the grain that was lost was replaced, and we may guess for ourselves what that fact meant to the death-rate of the ravaged territories. But in 1813 the political economists got into the government councils, when famine was again on the wing, and declared that trade, if left to its own natural course, would do more to relieve distress than all the measures the government could take. This sinister counsel was acted on; government interfered neither with exports nor imports; and as there was a computed loss of 325,000 tons of grain in the region affected, we are left to measure the mathematical proportions between such a deficiency and the mortality returns by something more tangible than the usual unknown quantity. When a couple of pounds of grain per day suffice to support a man, it is easy enough to guess how many could be preserved from starvation for six months by such a quantity as the country lost in this particular famine. But in the next one, which took place only four years later, over much the same area, the loss of food was nearly four times that amount. Fifteen millions of people were severely affected, and the deaths from hunger, at the lowest computation, were a million. They occurred among the class for whom, says Sir James Caird, the government refused, *on principle*, to make any provision to save them from perishing by starvation. The suffering endured, he says, left a widespread and lasting recollection of the horrors of that awful visitation.

About this time the idea of relief works, as some sort of panacea, began to be entertained and applied. But the principle was tried in such a way as to make it available only to the smallest possible number. Long distances had to be walked in order to get to the relief works, and conditions were attached which made the acceptance of help impossible to many because of debilitation from hunger, religious and caste obstacles, and sundry other impediments. The relief works, in this instance, as well in several

other subsequent crises, appeared to be designed as a deterrent rather than a benefit to the people. There always are economists for whom relief works have a peculiar fascination as a debatable theme. Anything that helps to save the famine-stricken people from destruction is very often denounced by such theorists as having a demoralizing tendency.

Something more ingenious to keep the starving away from the relief centres was devised by the time of the next great famine, which was in 1861, and in nearly the same territory as the two preceding ones. This was getting the claimants for relief into enclosed poor-houses and serving them with cooked food. Caste regulations making it impossible for people to accept food cooked by persons of a different caste without becoming pariahs, the effectiveness of this provision, in keeping away applicants for relief, may easily be surmised. For those too old or too enfeebled by hunger to walk or to work, no provision was made; they were left, as Sir James Caird pithily says, "to the charitable public." The population affected numbered thirteen millions, and of these less than 1 per cent. received employment or relief. Three more famines occurred from that period down to 1868–69, with a loss of life estimated at about 1,800,000. But in the last-named period the government finally woke up to the fact that it was responsible for the lives of the people, and made some effort to do its duty. Effective measures were taken to cope with the distress, which affected forty-five millions of people, and slew of these a million six hundred thousand, besides causing the migration of a million of the population of the State of Marwar.

It was reserved, however, for the humane administration of Lord Northbrook, with the help of Sir Richard Temple, to demonstrate that mortality from famine was entirely preventible if disaster were met promptly and in a proper spirit. In the great famine in Behar, in 1873, the political economists were turned down, and the importation of half a million tons of rice, together with the prompt establishment of an efficient transport service to all the imperilled districts, prevented much suffering. Besides these measures, work was provided for all who were able to work, and raw food was supplied to those who were incapable of labor, at their own homes, in place of the forbidden cooked kinds which had driven many sufferers in previous famines to choose starvation rather than accept it. But this wise and merciful policy was, in a great measure, departed from, partly because the area of suffering was wider and the machinery for relief inadequate, in the next great visitations, which were the largest of any during the century, in the years 1876–78. Here the scarcity was continued over two years, and there arose a want of understanding between

the administrations of the different provinces involved. Nearly three millions of people perished in these awful years.

We have the word of Mr. Julian Hawthorne, who lately made a flying tour through part of the hunger-smitten territories, that previous to his advent about four millions of people had died from the present visitation. This was only an approximation, as no regular statistics were available. A million and a half more were on the relief lists; and these, being nothing more than creatures of skin and bone when he wrote, either had joined the victims or become so hopelessly wrecked in constitution as to make the few years that may remain to them a mere prolongation of misery. All the people he met, except the English officials and the better class of cultivators, were horrible walking skeletons. But, as fully one-half the Indian population belong to the landless class, who have no resource or outlook in bad times, we are justified in accepting even the tremendously large estimates of deaths given as entirely short of the actual truth. Where 50 per cent. of the population are all at once reduced to a pauper condition, and no food anywhere within reach, what are we to infer from such a position but that it means death to all who do not receive help immediate and continuous? We have it on official statements that in some of the famine periods the grain distributed or the money expended would not cover one-twentieth part of the ascertained deficiency in the harvest. Are we not justified, then, in concluding that the amount of the absent nineteenths measured the number of deaths of those whom it would be, if present, capable of feeding?

We see as plainly as day that the causes of these appalling famines is the denudation of the money of the land by the Anglo-Indian government. If the old native rulers exacted, as it is alleged, in defence, a higher rate of assessment than the British conquerors, they were satisfied to make the levy in kind; and if the harvest fell short of the computation, they bore their share of the deficiency as well as the cultivator. But where the assessment is a money levy, payable on a fixed day, in anticipation of a harvest that may never realize the expectation, how gravely does it alter the situation. The land-tax, in such a case, means simply a sentence of death to millions of people. In neglecting to provide out of the people's money, as repeatedly urged by men of sense and humanity like the Wellingtons, the Napiers, and the Campbells, a permanent fund for the relief of these duly-scheduled famines, regular as the diurnal motion of our planet, the Anglo-Indian government challenges the coroner's court of all humanity. It is not amenable to human judgment, no matter what the verdict, but it is not superior to the decrees of eternal

justice. The Nemesis which never failed to overtake the most firmly-rooted and immemorial despotism will one day avenge the nameless graves of the Indian highway and jungle. It is impossible to read history and not arrive at such a conviction.

It is in the power of Great Britain to avert the penalty of the awful misrule of India by reforming the whole administration. The very minimum of reparation that ought presently to be made is the establishment of a famine fund. One million seven hundred thousand pounds a year is the estimate for the establishment of such a fund made by competent economists. Such a sum is a mere trifle out of the enormous tribute wrung from the Indian people annually for the payment of pampered officials. The amount might easily be subscribed on the London Exchange in one hour were there any real interest in the English capital in the fate of the myriads of unhappy people whose enslavement was first devised in that same money-mart by the establishment of the chartered East India Company. It is the most mistaken philanthropy on Mr. Hawthorne's part to commend to American benevolence the project of starting such a fund. The wealth of India has made England, in very large degree, the enormously rich country that she is; even in the way of commerce little of India's capital has ever found its way to America's shore. Were it the case of a famine unexpectedly visiting a country which was ordinarily mistress of her own resources, it would require no appeal to our humanity to elicit our practical sympathy. Here the case is entirely different. England deliberately makes the pauperism, and England alone must bear the burden of relief and responsibility.

We are too apt to lose sight of the exact political and social relations which subsist between England and her vast but wretched dependency. They are unique in the modern political dispensation. The political relation is that of force alone. A country which at home is ruled on the strictest constitutional democratic principle, maintains supremacy over a region containing one-fourth of all the world's people simply by the irresponsible method of self-sufficient force. That force, originally climbing to mastery by the ladder of cunning, makes no attempt of moral justification for its presence. In ancient days of colonization, wherever the Roman eagle fought his way, Roman civilization followed in his wake. It was the privilege of the conquered people to become in time, if they chose, sharers in Roman citizenship, with a voice in the administration of their own provinces. Many a provincial found his way to the Forum as a pleader, to the army as a general, to the imperial throne even as a *divus*. But to India the English conquest brought nothing but hopeless subjection. There is no

fitness of conditions for assimilation between victor and vanquished, and there is no attempt or intention to make the experiment. The principle of taxation without representation, which has been repudiated all over Europe, is put into force in the East with no higher justification than the unquestioned practice of immemorial centuries. What held good in the days of Darius is deemed sufficient in ethics now. It is the clime which makes the principle of constitutionalism. The man who seeks office under the British Ministry, in order to gain a place on the Indian Council, must go to the hustings and expatiate on the glories of that constitution whose existence gives the lie to slavery; but when the scene is shifted to Calcutta, he finds his relations to humanity metamorphosed. The Englishman is thus the Jekyll and Hyde of the political world; and there is no other nation which furnishes another such curious example of duality in public life.

If the Anglo-Saxon political system has made no effort to justify alien intrusion in oriental affairs, more conspicuous still has been the failure of social intercourse to mitigate the relations of the enslaver and the subjugated. A haughty contempt for the conquered millions is the distinctive characteristic of the English official class, civil no less than military. The judicial system which obtains in India is not founded on any principles of equity, English or other, but acts on a code of its own based on the axiom that might makes the right. The most flagrant injustice, in all cases where English interests are opposed to native claims, is daily perpetrated in every district. Here is an example cited by Sir James Caird. The revenue officer claimed from a certain village near Surat a sum of four thousand rupees as land assessment. The inhabitants produced a "sunnud," instrument of a former native ruler, decreeing that one thousand rupees was to be the permanent assessment for the land, and no more. Of course, when this territory was ceded to the British it was on the understanding that every sovereign act of its former rulers was to stand; in the same way as every charter granted by an English monarch is good for all time. The collector being insistent, the villagers appealed to the court, and got a decision in their favor. The collector, however, appealed to a higher one, and still the case went against him—inasmuch as a question of treaty-right was involved, it is to be presumed. But the government at Calcutta swept aside the legal decisions, and decreed that for the future such cases should be tried, not by the courts, but by the local revenue officers!

Insolence and injustice of this cynical kind have engendered everywhere a deep-seated feeling of repulsion for English officialdom. "It is singularly illustrative of our rule," writes Sir James

Caird, who cannot certainly be accused of hostility toward his own side, "that though the people for six generations have known no other, we are still strangers among them. Our representatives come and go, now faster than ever, and we and they look on each other with distrust." A much stronger term, one may well think, would be by no means out of place. The sentiments which inspire "curses not loud but deep" against men of the Macbeth pattern are what must be felt by the majority of the oppressed. Mr. Alfred Webb, an estimable member of an old Quaker family in Ireland, lately made a prolonged tour in India, and describes the deportment of the Anglo Indian minority there as arbitrary and overbearing to an insufferable degree. Their manner toward the natives may be gauged from the fact that in the chief hotels he visited he saw notices posted requesting visitors "not to beat the servants." This little intimation in itself contains a world of meaning. In all the courts he attended, as an observer, he beheld shocking travesties of justice in cases where native and European interests were in conflict.

The litigious habits of the Hindoos make them easy victims for the wretched brood of native lawyers, but the chief impelling cause of this litigation is the robbery of the omnipresent Bunyia. It is out of the higher plundering of the dominant power that the Bunyia has sprung into existence; in the native-ruled states he is not allowed to get a footing. To this unhappy weakness of the Hindoo is to be added a tendency to perjury and prevarication. Who can wonder at it? Tyranny ever teaches cunning and equivocation and every low artifice, to evade the mandates of despotism. The Hindoos only practice on a small scale the vices which gained for those above them the golden thrones, the sceptres and the galaxies of priceless jewels of that vast empire of the Moguls, rich in gold and barbaric pearl.

We are powerless in words when we read of those dreadful famine ravages. Their horror becomes deadened by distance and repetition. Were we doomed to witness such things with our own eyes, our indignation might prove too much for our good sense. But we ought not to let the distance and the monotony of recurrence dull our judgment about the cause or chill our sympathy for the miserable victims of man's lust of power and gawds and gold. Stupendous tragedies move along the stage to emphasize the exaltation of Great Britain's horn. The wailings of myriads are sought to be drowned by the fanfare of jubilee and the thunder of earth-defying navies. But every corpse that sinks into an unknown grave, the victim of hunger in that blighted land, must rise as an accusing witness against a system which lends a sinister meaning to the word "civilization." JOHN J. O'SHEA.

THE EXPULSION OF THE ACADIANS—1755.

ACADIA. MISSING LINKS OF A LOST CHAPTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY. By *Edouard Richard.* Two Volumes. Montreal: John Lovell & Son. 1895.

UN PÉLERINAGE AU PAYS D'EVANGÉLINE. Par *l'Abbé H. R. Casgrain.* Quebec. 1888.

UNE COLONIE FÉODALE EN AMERIQUE. Par *Rameau de Saint-Père.* Two Volumes. Paris. 1889.

ACADIA. A LOST CHAPTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY. By *Philip H. Smith.* Pawling, N. Y. 1884.

MONTCALM AND WOLFE (1884); A HALF CENTURY OF CONFLICT (1893). By *Francis Parkman.* Boston.

Longfellow's "Evangeline."

"THE work I am now undertaking," writes M. Richard,[1] "has never been done before." This, in a very definite sense, is a simple statement of fact. M. Richard's "Acadia"—the work of an Acadian familiar with all the histories, documents and oral traditions connected with the fate of his people—is the latest, and, at the same time, the most complete attempt to elucidate a very difficult question, namely, "Why were the Acadians banished?"

The ordinary version, as it may be called, is practically as follows: "The name (Acadia), with the lying legend of British cruelty connected with it, has been embalmed, not in amber, but in barley-sugar, by the author of 'Evangeline.'

"Lieutenant-Governor Adam Archibald, Mr. Parkman and Dr. Kingston have completely disposed of this fiction, and shown that the deportation of the Acadians was a measure of necessity, to which recourse was had only when forbearance was exhausted."[2]

This is the case for the prosecution; what is that for the defence?

"All the importance of this history of Acadia," says M. Richard,[3] "from the English conquest in 1710 until 1763, was centered in the events that brought about the transportation, in the transportation itself, and in its consequences. . . . . This is the aspect of the story I am about to tell. It is the only part of Acadian history that presents a real and varied interest; it ought, therefore, to have been related in detail; and yet all we have of

[1] Vol. i., Introductory Remarks, p. 1.

[2] *Canada and the Canadian Question*, by Goldwin Smith, quoted by Richard, ii., p. 361.

[3] Vol. i., pp. 2, 3.

it, so far, is a rough sketch that leaves out the palpitating pity of it all.

"How comes it that the documents of so important a period have disappeared? Was this the result of accident or design?" Himself, as has been said, a descendant of the Acadian exiles, familiar with all their traditions, whose "whole childhood was spent in an Acadian settlement,"[1] where "were still alive the sons of those who had been deported," and, for that reason, peculiarly well fitted to deal with the question—prejudice apart—has made a study of all the writings bearing on the subject. Those quoted at the beginning of this article may be considered as the principal ones, there being, of course, many others to which M. Richard refers.[2]

"The volume of archives," he continues,[3] "published in 1869 by order of the Legislature (of Nova Scotia), was edited by Thomas B. Akins, Commissioner of the Public Archives of the Province. I do not hesitate to affirm that the documents have been selected with the greatest partiality, and with the purpose, poorly disguised in the very preface, of getting together such papers as might justify the deportation of the 'Acadians.'" "It is very remarkable," writes Haliburton,[4] "that there are no traces of this important event to be found among the records of the Secretary's office at Halifax. I could not discover that the correspondence had been preserved, or that the orders, returns and memorials had ever been filed there. The particulars of the affair seem to have been carefully concealed, although it is not easy to assign the reason, unless the parties were, as they well might be, ashamed of the transaction."

That was in 1829. "The existing documents," writes Abbé Casgrain,[5] "were classified in 1860, before M. Rameau made his journey to Halifax with a view to putting the finishing touches to his 'Historie d'une Colonie Féodale.' The archivist of that date seemed to have made it his task to awaken the suspicions of the public."

M. Rameau de Saint-Père was, we are told, shown, "on a table, a certain number of registers and volumes," but was forbidden "to make any copy or extract." He was not even allowed to sit down. It is hardly to be wondered at that he should have recalled Haliburton's suspicions; that he should have noticed "the *lacunæ* that existed at certain epochs in these archives; *lacunæ* which the extracts published in 1869 at Halifax have not filled up."[6]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 2. [2] Pp. 10, 11. [3] P. 13.
[4] *Nova Scotia*, vol. i., p. 196; published in 1829, quoted by Abbé Casgrain, p. 54.
[5] P. 55. [6] P. 56.

It was to set these doubts at rest, if possible, that the Abbé Casgrain visited the Public Record Office in London and the British Museum. "I must say," he continues, "first of all, that the facility with which one has access to these archives forms a striking contrast to the system of distrust established at Halifax. I must add, thereto, that I have obtained proof that our suspicions were only too well founded.

"The 'Selection of Documents' published at Halifax was evidently made with a view to justify the Government of Nova Scotia (in the matter) of the deportation of the Acadians. For this purpose they have systematically eliminated . . . . those which might best establish the rights of the Acadians."

M. Richard's first point, therefore, the incompleteness of the documents connected with the case, would seem to be clearly proved; as, also, his charge that these documents have been manipulated with the one definite object of making out a strong argument in support of the (supposed) necessity of banishing the Acadians.

The "fiction" concerning their expulsion, as Professor Goldwin Smith is pleased to call it, may, after all, rest upon a very solid foundation in fact. The question arises: Was Parkman aware of the evidence in favor of the Acadians? "As to Parkman," says M. Richard,[1] "I have positive proof that he knew of it, but chose to ignore it." It is certainly a fact that Parkman, in his "Half Century of Conflict," written in 1893, modified, very considerably, some of the more sweeping accusations made against the Acadians in his "Montcalm and Wolfe," published in 1884, which would go to show that he had seen reason to change his opinions concerning them to that extent, at least.

If, then, it is possible that the Acadians were unjustly treated—to use no stronger term—who, in M. Richard's opinion, is responsible? "This book will," he writes,[2] "in my judgment, effectually clear England's Home Government's honor of the deepest historic stain ever attached to it. Let the stigma be obliterated which England has hitherto borne; burn it into the foreheads of Lawrence, Belcher, Wilmot, Morris and their accomplices." The two principal points of M. Richard's "Introductory Remarks" are, in fact, these, namely; the incompleteness of the official records, and the non-complicity of the Home Government in the final act of deportation.

Starting from these two assumptions—the force and truth of which it is M. Richard's object to prove—it may be well to follow him, and others, through the main outlines of the history of the

---

[1] Vol. i., p. 12. [2] P. 16.

events which culminated in the expulsion of 1755, filling in some of the details—those, especially, which strengthen M. Richard's case—by way of conclusion.

By the Treaty of Utrecht, concluded on the 11th of April, 1713,[1] it was stipulated that "all Nova Scotia, or Acadia, comprehended within its ancient boundaries, as also the city of Port Royal, now called Annapolis," be yielded and made over to the Queen of Great Britain and to her crown forever.[2] "France," writes Rameau de Saint-Père,[3] "ceded Acadia to England as an object of small value; without explanations, without special conditions; even the limits were not settled. . . ." France, however, retained Cape Breton, Prince Edward's, and other islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.[4] The fact that the French population was thus arbitrarily divided by an arrangement entered into by the Governments of Great Britain and of France is one of capital importance, in view of the difficulties connected with the taking of an unrestricted oath of allegiance by those Acadians who thus passed under the sway of the former. The only enemies—Indians, of course, excepted—against whom they could be called upon to fight were their neighbors, kinsmen, and fellow-Frenchmen. Nor should the further fact—of somewhat minor importance, but still of considerable weight—be left out of account, namely, that of "a Protestant English garrison (small in numbers) holding military domination by conquest over a French Catholic subjugated people (about 2500 in all);[5] that there should be a lack of feeling and interest and a mutual distrust and hatred of one another, is not strange."[6]

The article of the Treaty of Utrecht, however, which is of chief interest, is the fourteenth. It is as follows: "It is expressly provided that in all the said places and colonies to be yielded and restored by the Most Christian King in pursuance of this treaty, the subjects of the said king *may have liberty to remove themselves within a year to any other place*, as they shall think fit, *with all their movable effects*. . . . ."[7]

These terms are, surely, sufficiently explicit, and were, moreover, reiterated, even more fully, in a letter written by Queen Anne to Governor Nicholson, dated June 23, 1713.[8] And yet Rameau de Saint-Père asserts that[9] "from 1714, the Governors of Annapolis spared no efforts to prevent the Acadians from leaving Nova Scotia. . . ." It is to the history of these same efforts that M. Richard devotes a great part of his work.

---

[1] Smith, p. 113; Casgrain, p. 59; Richard (I.), p. 66; Rameau (I.), p. 356.
[2] Smith, *loc. cit.* [3] *Ut sup.* [4] Smith, p. 114. [5] Smith, *ibid.* [6] *Ibid.*, p. 115.
[7] Richard (I.), p. 74; Smith, p. 116; Rameau (I.), p. 357; Casgrain, p. 59.
[8] Richard, *loc. cit.* [9] Vol. ii., p. 2.

"The first documents introduced into the volume of the archives (of Nova Scotia) are dated November, 1714. . . . The documents between 1710 and November, 1714, were particularly important, in order to determine in a precise manner what had been done, both by the Governors and by the Acadians, in respect of those clauses of the treaty that referred to their departure."[1] If the Acadians did not leave at the end of the year specified by the Treaty of Utrecht, why did they remain? If it can be shown that they remained of their own free will, then such action, on their part, constituted a tacit recognition of their allegiance to Great Britain. If, however, it can be shown that they had practically no choice in the matter—other than an appeal to arms—then the fact that they were compelled to remain removes any obligation on their part to fulfil the terms of the treaty, as far, that is, as concerns the taking of an unqualified oath of allegiance. If the Governors failed to keep terms with them, they were surely not to blame if they followed the example set them.

As a matter-of-fact, however, it will be seen, by M. Richard's account of the events which occurred between 1713 and 1755—an account substantiated, in its main outlines, by Smith, Casgrain, and Rameau de Saint-Père, as well as by official records—that the Acadians, in spite of all the artifices used to detain them, were perfectly willing to take the oath of allegiance, provided only that they could be assured *that they would not be called upon to fight against the French or Indians.* Parkman says, simply, "Very few availed themselves of this right,"[2] namely, that of withdrawing from the country, but gives no hint of any difficulties having been put in the way of their doing so. This is but a sample of his favorite method of using only such facts as suit his purpose; were there no fuller account of what occurred during this period, the case against the Acadians would be complete.

The English—meaning thereby the Governor and his garrison—had, indeed, what Rameau de Saint-Père calls "un interet majeur"[3] in preventing, if possible, the departure of the Acadians. "Nicholson," writes the Abbé Casgrain,[4] "had flattered himself that the Acadians would not so lightly abandon the fertile lands which they occupied," and was, therefore, not a little astonished at finding them fully determined to do so, rather than take an unqualified oath of allegiance. "The consequences of this determination," the same author continues, "were fatal to the new province which Nicholson prided himself on having conquered for England." He had the very strongest reasons for opposing their departure.

[1] Richard (I.), pp. 79-80.
[2] Montcalm and Wolfe (I.), p. 91.
[3] Vol. ii., p. 7.
[4] P. 62.

The Abbé Casgrain states, distinctly,[1] that Nicholson "made it impossible for the Acadians to sell their lands and their effects, by forbidding the English to buy anything of them." He would not allow the French ships, which were intended for their transport, to enter the Acadian harbors, nor would he allow the Acadians to write to Boston. According to M. Richard,[2] he would not even permit them to obtain from Louisbourg the rigging required to equip the ships they had built for themselves. It is easy enough for Parkman to say that "very few availed themselves" of the right to depart; considering the obstacles placed in the way of their doing so, from the very outset, it is a wonder that any were successful. "With what we know of human nature," writes M. Richard,[3] "with the teachings of history in general . . . . no one, taking into account the grave interests that the departure of the Acadians compromised, will doubt the obstacles of every kind opposed to their departure." Their claim to do so had been "referred" to the Queen by Governor Nicholson, a convenient way of evading the responsibility of an adverse decision; "and this never-to-be-settled reference," as M. Richard says,[4] "is most likely the pretext afterwards used by the Governors to prevent the Acadians from departing in any kind of ships. . . . ."

This may be called the first point in favor of the Acadians. At the end of the year specified by the Treaty of Utrecht they were fully determined to leave home and country rather than accept an unqualified oath of allegiance to Great Britain. That they did not leave was due entirely to the fact that every possible obstacle was put in the way of their doing so. Moreover, being of a simple, upright nature, wholly unversed in the tricks of diplomacy, they doubtless believed that the matter must, in the end, be settled as they wished it.

In 1715 Lieutenant-Governor Caulfield sent "Messrs. Peter Capoon and Thomas Button, officers of the garrison," to Mines and other places, for the proclaiming the accession of King George, and of obtaining the oaths of allegiance "in ye form prescribed."[5] "On the 15th of the following May," M. Richard continues, "Caulfield acquaints the Lords of Trade with the result of the mission of Peter Capoon and Thomas Button: 'Here inclosed are the transactions of MM. Button and Capoon, by which you will find that ye inhabitants, being most of them French, refused the oath, *having, as I am informed, refused to quit the collonny* intirely, and settle under ye French government, and I humblie desire to be informed how I shall behave to them. . . . .'"

The documents relating to the period between 1710 and 1715

[1] P. 64. [2] Vol. i., p. 87. [3] Vol. i., p. 98. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 90. [5] P. 100.

being wholly absent from the Nova Scotia archives as compiled by Thomas B. Akins, those who might happen to accept the compilation as a fair and trustworthy account of the events leading to the deportation of the Acadians would naturally be surprised to find that, five years after the cession of the Colony, and two years after the Treaty of Utrecht, the Acadians are accused of refusing the oath, and also of "refusing" to quit the Colony. As a matter of fact, it has been shown, by official records, that it had been made impossible for them to leave, however anxious they might be to do so; this fact, however, is carefully omitted by the compiler; and Parkman,—who, at the best, followed him without question,—states, as quoted, that "very few availed themselves" of the right of departure. He adds, moreover,[1] that "the English authorities seem to have shown throughout an unusual patience and forbearance." How far this assertion coincides with the fact that the Acadians were detained by every means possible is not difficult to determine.

According to the Abbé Casgrain,[2] the "test oath involving an act of apostasy (for Catholics), there could be no question of imposing it." The form, as given by him,[3] is as follows: "Je promets sincèrement et je jure que je veux être fidèle et tenir une veritable allegiance à la Majesté le Roi George, Ainsi Dieu me soit en aide." The Acadians of Mines and of Beaubassin replied to the effect that, had they not made engagements since the previous summer—an allusion to a visit from French delegates—to return under the rule of the King of France, they would be delighted to remain under that of King George. They likewise bound themselves to fidelity during such time as they should remain in the Colony. Those of Port Royal (Annapolis), that is to say, in the immediate vicinity of the garrison, proposed an alternative formula much to the same effect, namely, a promise of allegiance and fidelity *so long as they should remain in Acadia*, and containing a stipulation that they should be "permitted to withdraw wheresoever I shall think fit, with all my movable goods and effects, when I shall think fit, without any one being able to hinder me."

This proposal seems, M. Richard says, "to have been accepted by Caulfield,"[4] and, if so, is in manifest contradiction to his statement, made to the Lords of Trade, that he had "been informed" that the Acadians had "refused to quit the Colony." The omission of these documents, also, from the archives serves, of course, to strengthen the case against the Acadians, just as the fact of their existence strongly supports M. Richard's contention that they

---

[1] Montcalm and Wolfe (I.), p. 91.
[2] P. 75.
[3] *Cf.* Richard (I.), pp. 101, 102.
[4] P. 103.

were omitted for that very purpose, and that the archives contain an incomplete, mutilated and partial account of the events they profess to relate.

"The position of this people," writes the Abbé Casgrain,[1] "remained the same under the successor of Caulfield, John Doucet, whose name shows clearly an Acadian descent, turned Protestant. This Governor already began to use, as an accusation against the Acadians, the enforced detention to which his predecessors had caused them to submit." This, again, hardly accords with Parkman's statement as to the "unusual patience and forbearance" shown by the English Governors towards the Acadians, but is certainly perfectly consistent with what has been shown to have been their real line of conduct, namely, a determination to *prevent*, by all the means in their power, the departure of those from whom, at the same time, they demanded an unqualified oath of allegiance —an oath which, it cannot be too often insisted on, would appear to the Acadians to involve the danger, or rather the certainty, of being called upon to fight against their friends and neighbors.

Doucet,[2] appointed in 1717, was succeeded in 1720 by General Philipps. "At first," writes Richard,[3] "he dealt very haughtily with the Acadians. Hardly had he arrived when he issued a proclamation ordering them to take the oath without reserve or to leave the country within four months, without being able to dispose of their goods or to transport them. . . . These conditions," M. Richard continues, "were excessively hard. Is that the reason why the compiler omits this important document, this proclamation?" "Philipps," says the Abbé Casgrain,[4] "was about to profit by the inaction to which the Acadians had been condemned, in order to arrogate to himself an authority over them to which he had not the least right." That is to say, that he professed to assume that the Acadians had become British subjects by the simple fact that they still remained in the Colony. To his surprise, in spite of the consternation caused by his proclamation, he found the Acadians determined to depart by land, since they could not go by sea. Notwithstanding his strenuous prohibition, one of their missionaries, Father Justinian, the Curé of Mines, made his way to Louisbourg[5] to consult with the Governor as to what was to be done. That a simple, pastoral people, without knowledge of the outside world, should have recourse, in their difficulties, to those who had proved themselves their best—in fact, their only—friends, namely, to their clergy, was, surely, what they might be expected to do. Parkman, however,[6] asserts—wholly without proof—that "there is no doubt that in a little time they would have complied, had they

[1] P. 77. [2] Richard spells the name "Doucette." [3] Vol. i., p. 113.
[4] Pp. 79, 80. [5] Casgrain, p. 83. [6] Montcalm and Wolfe, p. 91.

been let alone; but the French authorities of Canada and Cape Breton (Ile Royale) did their utmost to prevent them, and employed agents to keep them hostile to Great Britain. Of these, the most efficient were the French priests, who, in spite of the treaty, persuaded their flocks that they were still subjects of King Louis." The animus that inspired this sweeping accusation is revealed in the words "in spite of the treaty." Even were the charge true in every particular, neither the French nor the priests had been the first to violate the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht. The English Governors had been the principal offenders in this respect. As they had made the stipulated departure of the Acadians practically impossible, and the Acadians had, consequently, refused the oath of allegiance—which was clearly within their treaty rights—they unquestionably remained French subjects. That the French authorities and the clergy should so consider them was only what they were perfectly justified in doing.

"The Treaty of Utrecht remained in force," writes Abbé Casgain,[1] and the Governor had, of course, no power to abrogate any of its terms. His proclamation was manifestly in direct contravention of the stipulations respecting the sale or removal by the Acadians of their property, should they decide to emigrate—a fact of which he was politely reminded by M. de Brouillan, the Governor of Louisbourg.[2] Philipps probably knew nothing of the obstacles that had been placed by his predecessors in the way of the Acadians, in order to prevent their departure. He merely recognized the state of affairs actually existing, namely, that the Acadians were still in the Colony, but had not yet taken the oath of allegiance, and seems to have made up his mind to bring matters to a decisive issue one way or another. Hence his imperious proclamation; his claim of full powers to settle everything;[3] his prohibition to the missionaries, to the effect that they must not quit the Colony. "He well knew," says M. Richard,[4] "that, as they were the only inhabitants of the country (the handful of men at his disposition excepted), they would have no one to whom they might sell their goods in case they departed, and that is why he chose this means of attaining his end and preventing their departure."

He was destined to discover, however, that they were determined to depart at any cost, rather than take an oath of allegiance which might involve their being called upon to fight against the French. Unable to procure ships, they set to work, in large numbers, to make the necessary roads. That is to say, they showed themselves ready to depart, to accept the Governor's alternative, to

---

[1] P. 80. [2] Richard (I.), p. 116. [3] Casgrain, p. 82. [4] Vol. i., p. 118.

comply with the terms of his proclamation. "And, nevertheless," M. Richard continues,[1] "they must not be allowed to depart." He proceeds to prove, on the authority of official documents, that Philipps, following the example of his predecessors, issued a proclamation forbidding the Acadians to continue their task of road-making. In other words, he also made it impossible—short of actual conflict—for the Acadians to leave the Colony, *as he had ordered them to do!*

"It was one of the great mistakes of the Acadians," writes Abbé Casgrain,[2] "not to have persevered in this idea; they would, no doubt, have had to suffer great misery, but they would have escaped far greater misfortunes." They might, of course, have risen in revolt, in which event the insignificant garrison of Port Royal (Annapolis) would have been practically powerless against them. This was pointed out to Philipps by his most experienced officers,[3] and bitterly recognized by him. In sending to London the report of his engineer-officer, Mascarene,[4] he says: "We have here only the shadow of a government; its authority does not extend beyond a cannon-shot from the fort."[5]

It is in the bitterness of conscious failure that he strives to throw the blame of his want of success on others, especially on the "bigoted priests," to whom, as a matter-of-fact, he owed it that the Acadians had not risen in revolt. "In such a situation," writes Abbé Casgrain,[6] "it must be admitted that the Government of Port Royal was very fortunate in having to do with a population so reasonable and peaceable as the Acadians. And who had formed them thus, who advised them, who prevented their revolting? It was the missionaries, the very missionaries who were accused of being the authors of all the harm. They, as we know, had only to say a word in order to raise the Acadians in a body, which, by the way, they had a perfect right to do. This word the missionaries did not utter. If there is a reproach to make them, it is that of having too much preached submission, and of having, possibly, thus prepared the evils to come." Certainly, the missionaries either had or had not that power over their flocks which their adversaries attribute to them. If they had, they used it, as the Abbé Casgrain asserts, in the cause of peace; if not, what becomes of the accusations made against them?

"In his vexation," writes M. Richard,[7] "Philipps had shown only the dark side," making out that the Acadians would never become good subjects, and suggesting that they should not be allowed to depart until they could be replaced by British subjects "in the spring"; and adding that he did not think the Acadians

[1] P. 119. [2] P. 85. [3] Casgrain, p. 90. [4] Afterwards Lieutenant-Governor.
[5] Casgrain, pp. 91, 92. [6] P. 92. [7] Vol. i., p. 123.

would withdraw before then. He "painted it so vividly," adds M. Richard, "as to affect the Lords of Trade, who wrote under date of December 20th, 1720: '. . . . As to the Acadians of Nova Scotia, who appear *so wavering* in their dispositions, we are apprehensive that they will never become good subjects to His Majesty. . . . . *We are of opinion they ought to be removed as soon as the forces which we have proposed to be sent to you shall arrive in your Province; but as you are not to attempt their removal without His Majesty's positive order* for that purpose, you will do well, in the meanwhile, *to continue the same prudent and cautious conduct towards them*, and endeavor *to undeceive them concerning the exercise of their religion*, which will doubtless be allowed them *if it should be thought proper to allow them to stay where they are.*' "[1]

This letter, and one much more explicit, addressed by Craggs, the Secretary of State, to Philipps in person, hardly agree, as M. Richard admits,[2] "with the declaration in my introductory remarks exonerating the Home Government from all complicity in this iniquitous deportation." Rameau de Saint-Père, less favorable to Great Britain than the descendant of the Acadians himself, takes the worst possible view of this letter. He calls it "a wonder of its kind," and declares that "it completes and explains the involved phrases in which Philipps had wrapped his little Machiavellism. . . . . In these phrases," he continues, "stiff and frozen in appearance, we feel the anger that broods in secret in the heart. Under the crafty exterior it is obliged to assume, this hidden anger (colère contenue) grows venomous, and turns to rage with time, to burst forth, furious, blind, and bestial, in 1755, after having fermented during thirty-five years. There is the true secret of the excesses committed by the English at that period; and the good souls who are surprised by them have no need, in order to explain them, to impute imaginary crimes to the Acadians. We can now say with certainty that the proscription was not an act improvised *ab irato*, but prepared and meditated for a long time; it was already thought of in 1720!" Further on he adds that Philipps managed to prolong the situation for two years "without denying the duplicity of Nicholson, but also without accepting the oath with a reservation which the Acadians demanded; without pronouncing on their absolute right to remain, but also without insisting on their departure. . . . . He thus arrived at 1722, the year when he returned to Europe."[3]

---

[1] M. Richard adds, in a note, that Parkman had this document before him, but that "it was not of the right sort."

[2] Vol. i., p. 125.

[3] Vol. ii., pp. 35, 36, 37. This charge of *British* hatred against the Acadians, of a deliberate, long-considered plan of deportation, is a main feature of Rameau de Saint-Père's book, and will be again referred to in connection with the actual expulsion of the Acadians.

When, however, we consider the circumstances under which this letter of the Lords of Trade came to be written, the misrepresentations contained in the report made by Philipps, and chiefly the very terms of the letter itself, we are, surely, justified in arriving at the conclusion that it is not by any means incompatible with M. Richard's contention as to the non-complicity of the Home Government in "this iniquitous deportation." Still less does it justify the bitter charge made by Rameau de Saint-Père, quoted above. Philipps, it must be noted, is strictly enjoined "not to attempt their removal *without His Majesty's positive order*," and is informed that it may "be thought proper to allow them to stay where they are." The character of Craggs makes even his position insufficient to implicate the Home Government in any designs he may have formed. The real danger incident to such a document,—a danger for which the Lords of Trade could not, of course, be held responsible,—was the use to which it might, very possibly, be distorted by an unscrupulous Governor.

In 1722 "Philipps returned to England altogether disgusted with everything,"[1] as he well might be, and "John Doucette, who had been Lieutenant-Governor some time before the arrival of Philipps, resumed his functions, which he exercised until 1725."[2] He appears to have carried out the "same prudent and cautious conduct" towards the Acadians which had been recommended to Philipps by the Lords of Trade, and which that officer had been compelled—much against his will, doubtless—to adopt. The question of the oath was left in abeyance; the Acadians, as M. Richard says, were left to themselves.[3] This is probably why "the volume of the archives does not contain a single document of the period extending from 1722 to 1725."[4] M. Richard surmises, —with not a little show of reason,—that "the compiler, finding nothing in Doucette's correspondence to support his proofs (against the Acadians), found nothing worth reproducing."[5]

Doucet was succeeded in 1725 by Colonel Armstrong, a man of a very different stamp, "altogether unfit for the functions of a governor, even under the most favorable circumstances,"[6] far less at a period so difficult as that immediately under review. His one idea was to succeed where all his predecessors had failed, and to induce the Acadians to take the oath of allegiance by terror, if necessary.[7] The Acadians, however, knowing what they had to expect from him, prepared for a general emigration, during the course of the summer. This was, naturally, what Armstrong most wished to prevent; he therefore determined on a sudden

---

[1] Richard (I.), p. 133. [2] *Ibid.* [3] Vol. i., p. 135. [4] P. 134.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 135. [6] *Ibid.* [7] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

change of tactics,[1] and to try cajolery where threats had proved of no effect. According to Rameau de Saint-Père,[2] "he drew the Acadians into well-prepared meetings, where he held forth to them the great advantages they would secure to themselves by taking the oath, and by becoming hearty and loyal subjects of King George." He even went so far as to assure them that he, Armstrong, personally, would always put a favorable construction on the engagements into which he wished them to enter.

It was on Sunday, the 25th September, 1726, that the most important meeting took place, in the presence of the Acadian deputies and of a number of inhabitants. The scene that ensued did credit to his diplomacy, at least; it would have been comic, if it had not been of such serious import. His own account of it is given in full by Richard Casgrain and Rameau de Saint-Père, more briefly by Smith. He began by flattery; expressed his pleasure at seeing them, and hoped they had made up their minds at last to take the oath, like loyal subjects of King George. "Whereupon, at the request of some of the inhabitants, a French translation of the oath was read unto them."[3] Some of them demanded that a clause should be inserted exempting them from bearing arms (against the French or Indians). Armstrong assured them that they need have no anxiety on this head, as, according to the laws of Great Britain, *only Protestants were allowed to serve in the army!* Finding, however, that they still persisted in refusing to sign unless the exemption clause were inserted, the Governor, by the advice of his council, "consented that the said clause should be inscribed *on the margin of the French translation*,[4] in order," as he admits, "to get them over by degrees."[5] "There is no need," writes Abbé Casgrain,[6] "to say what became of the French translation, with its compromising marginal note. Armstrong had in his hands, in the shape of the English text, the instrument he had so long wished for, and which he was so proud to send to London, boasting that he had accomplished what no one had hitherto been able to do."

His success, as a matter-of-fact, was not so great as he wished it to be considered. Only the inhabitants of Port Royal (Annapolis) had, so far, been tricked into taking the oath. It still remained for him to induce "more than three-fourths of the entire population"[7] to do likewise; an attempt in which his emissaries, Bennett and Philipps, were entirely unsuccessful.[8]

A fresh, and, as Armstrong thought, a favorable opportunity presented itself on the occasion of the accession of George II.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 138. [2] Vol. ii., p. 39. [3] Richard, i., p. 138. [4] Rameau, ii., p. 40.
[5] Richard, i., p. 139. [6] Pp. 96, 97. [7] Richard, i., p. 140. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

The instructions given to his new agent, Lieutenant Robert Wroth, were found by Abbé Casgrain among the Colonial Records, in London, as well as the account furnished by Lieutenant Wroth himself.[1] It is not necessary to go into a detailed account of the transaction, which was, of course, very similar to the Annapolis affair of the previous year. The exemption clause was, naturally, to be once more inserted in the *margin* of the *French translation*, "*the English*," as Wroth admits,[2] "*being what I had to govern myself by.*"

Wroth, however, did not succeed without signing, most unwillingly, concessions which were, in effect, equivalent to those originally granted by Queen Anne, but which, according to Rameau de Saint-Père,[3] the English had never frankly accepted—a charge to which the conduct of most of the officials certainly lends color. The Acadians, once possessed of this document, which (seemingly) re-established their incontestable rights, no longer hesitated to take the oath according to the following formula: "Je promets et jure de bonne foi que je serai sincère et fidèle à Sa Majesté le Roi George le Second."[4]

Armstrong, from whom the inhabitants of Port Royal had exacted the same conditions as on the previous occasion, but who, this time, had lost his temper, qualified their demand as "insolent rebellion," and thrown their deputies into prison,[5] was furious with Wroth for having carried out, as closely as possible, the instructions received from the Governor himself! "By a decision of the council," writes Richard,[6] "the oath obtained by Wroth was declared 'null and void,' but . . . it was declared, in the same resolution, that, since the inhabitants had signed these acts and 'proclaimed His Majesty, they had become his subjects,'" with, of course, the privileges and obligations attached to their new status.

Even the fact that Armstrong had apparently succeeded in inducing the Acadians to take the oath of allegiance did not justify, in the opinion of the Lords of Trade, the methods to which he had resorted. They therefore "had recourse to Philipps, who always retained the title of Governor of Nova Scotia."[7] "This old intriguer," as Rameau de Saint-Père calls him,[8] "was not much more fortunate than Armstrong in the organization of Acadia, but as he had more manners, more intelligence and more *savoir-faire*, he was better able to save appear-

---

[1] Rameau de Saint-Père, ii., p. 43.

[2] Casgrain, p. 98. This piece is omitted from the volume of Nova Scotia Archives, published at Halifax.

[3] Rameau, ii., p. 44. [4] Casgrain, p. 101. [5] *Ibid.*

[6] Vol. i., p. 145. *Cf.* Rameau, ii., pp. 49, 50; Casgrain, *ut sup.*

[7] Richard, i., p. 146. [8] Vol. ii., p. 51.

ances, and even succeeded in bringing about at least a provisional pacification of the country." He succeeded, in fact, in persuading the Acadians to take the oath,[1] on the 26th of November, 1730, very easily, according to his version of the matter;[2] as a matter of simple fact, by granting them, *bon gré, mal gré*, the same concession which Armstrong had pretended to make—exemption from bearing arms against their compatriots, the French, or against their allies, the Indians.[3] The concession, however, was *verbal*, not written; to have granted a written exemption would have been in direct contravention to the orders he had received.[4] But the result was the same; after seventeen years of resistance, during which, according to Parkman,[5] "the English authorities seem to have shown an unusual patience and forbearance," the Acadians had become British subjects, and were known thenceforth—a fact to be remembered—as "French *Neutrals*." And yet the compiler to whom Richard refers so often[6] states that they were brought at last "*to take an unconditional oath willingly*," and Parkman makes no reference to any condition. However, from 1731 onwards, we hear no more of this question of the oath of allegiance until 1749. Philipps had evidently succeeded in satisfying both the Acadians and the home authorities; his having made a verbal concession would certainly seem to be the simplest, as it is, in fact, the only, explanation possible.

"Wearied of a bootless struggle," says M. Richard,[7] "the Acadians had accepted the oath of fealty which granted them the exemption which they clung to so earnestly. This period of twenty years (to 1749)," he continues, "was the most tranquil, the happiest and most prosperous in the history of Acadia."

Passing over the suicide of Armstrong, in 1739, the religious persecutions to which the Acadians were unquestionably exposed, in spite of the provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht, their abstention, during the war of 1744–48, from giving aid to the French—a fact to which Governor Mascarene bears ample witness,[8] though Parkman asserts, without proof, that "many . . . aided the enemy with information and supplies"[9]—we come to a date and to an event of great importance, the founding of Halifax, in 1749.

Hitherto, the effective power of the English Governors had practically not extended more than cannon-shot distance from the fort at Annapolis.[10] This fact, often insisted on by the Governors

---

[1] Of which the Lords of Trade complained that it was not explicit enough. Smith, p. 121.

[2] Rameau, ii., pp. 51, 52. [3] Casgrain, p. 102. [4] Richard, i., p. 148.

[5] Montcalm and Wolfe, p. 91. [6] Richard, i., p. 153. [7] Vol. i., p. 158.

[8] Casgrain, p. 113; Smith, p. 128; Richard, i., p. 230.

[9] Montcalm and Wolfe, p. 92. [10] Casgrain, p. 115.

in their reports to the home authorities, was brought into startling prominence by the cession of Louisbourg, according to the terms of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, and by French "encroachments" on the still undefined limits of Acadia.[1] The idea of founding Protestant English colonies in Acadia—the land to be confiscated from the French "Papists"—had been frequently discussed;[2] the growing French population, which now amounted to over 12,000,[3] seemed to render urgent the carrying out of the plan so often proposed.

"Chibucto Bay was chosen, and the founding of Halifax decided in March, 1749. Fourteen ships, bearing 2756 persons, with all the necessary provisions, and a complete civil organization . . . . set sail on May 14th, and entered Chibucto harbor June 27th following. Edward Cornwallis was the new Governor. Halifax was founded. The place was most judiciously chosen. . . . . In 1748 there were not a dozen English colonists in the whole province. The consequence was that the Annapolis garrison would not have been able to subsist without the Acadians . . . ."[4]

The foregoing quotation is a bare enumeration of facts, concerning which it would be difficult to decide as to whether any one of them is of greater importance than the others. The whole indicates a total change in the conditions of British rule in Acadia. Up to 1749 the garrison had been wholly inadequate to hold the province, and would have been unable to do so but for the peaceful disposition of the inhabitants, upon whom it had been, literally, dependent for its very existence. That is why no effort, no falsehood, no cajolery, no trickery had been spared to prevent, no matter by what means, their departure from the country. The founding of Halifax implied the existence of a strong, self-supporting British garrison and colony. It meant that the Acadians were no longer wanted. The consequences of this change soon became apparent. Between 1749 and 1751 the political physiognomy of Nova Scotia had been radically altered. "The claws of the British Lion," to use the Abbé Casgrain's expressive phrase, "had grown considerably longer."[5]

Nor were the Acadians themselves free from certain very natural misgivings, in view of this unexpected development, this sudden increase in the power of the English Governors. "A few days later," writes M. Richard,[6] "the Acadians of River Canard, Grand Pré and Pigiguit sent three deputies to the new Governor to present him, in their name, their respects and their homage." They were furnished with copies of a declaration, charging them with having aided the French during the war just ended, and with copies of an oath, "*sans réserve*,"[7] that was to be given to the in-

[1] Richard, i., p. 231. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 233. [3] Rameau, ii., p. 130.
[4] Richard i., pp. 234, 235. [5] P. 117. [6] Vol. i., p. 237. [7] Casgrain, p. 118.

habitants, "and were commanded to return within a fortnight,[1] and report the resolutions of their several departments."[2] Cornwallis evidently felt himself strong enough not to worry about the difference between his demand and the concessions granted by Armstrong and Philipps. The Acadians must take an *unconditional* oath, or go, within three months.

The reply of the Acadians, oppressed by the Governor's insistence on an oath which they could not bring themselves to take, urged by their French neighbors to emigrate to Cape Breton and to Canada, was a request that they might be allowed to quit the country, even, if need be, without selling their lands or taking their movables with them. It began to dawn on Cornwallis that he had mistaken the character of those with whom he had to deal; many were getting ready to go away, and he would, as he knew, be blamed by the home authorities for causing this inopportune and most unjust depopulation of the Colony, this most unwelcome increase of the French forces. "So, while on the one hand he was forcing the Acadians to choose between swearing allegiance and leaving the country, on the other he was giving orders to prevent them from taking advantage of his alternative."[3] All the old subterfuges were resorted to in order to hinder the Acadians from going; in the autumn of 1749 "they had not been allowed to leave in English, French or Acadian vessels; . . . . now (1750) the spring-time is denied them, for they must sow their land."[4] The facts here related rest on "documents written by the Governors themselves."[5]

"The refusal of the Acadians to take the required oath was," so Parkman asserts,[6] "not only not spontaneous, but was mainly due to influence from without." How far this statement accords with the facts just narrated may be easily decided; it is simply one instance, among many, of the American "historian's" bias. He continues: "The French officials of Cape Breton and Isle St. Jean, now Prince Edward Island, exerted themselves to the utmost, chiefly through the agency of the priests (!) to excite the people to refuse any oath that should commit them fully to British allegiance." Even were the charge literally true, the French, all things considered, were hardly to be blamed. But it is in reference to the Abbé Le Loutre, whom Parkman paints as the most cruel, most unprincipled, most reprehensible of priestly firebrands and political agents, that the difference between his sweeping generalities—doubtless very brilliant and effective—and M. Richard's calmer and more exact methods becomes most strikingly

[1] "Despite the long distances they had to travel."—Richard, *ut sup.*
[2] Smith, p. 149. [3] Richard, i., p. 244. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 250. [5] *Ibid.*
[6] Montcalm and Wolfe, p. 98.

apparent. It is for this reason that the matter merits to be dealt with, in passing, before coming to the final catastrophe.

M. Richard, in the first place, calls Le Loutre "a self-constituted agent of the French."[1] He next speaks of the influence of the French over the Indians of Nova Scotia, and of "the wicked and fatal policy"[2] of the Canadian Governors to which this influence was made subservient; of Le Loutre as their agent, by which he admits that he was more of a politician than a priest. "His blind zeal," M. Richard continues, "his efforts urging the Indians to worry the colonists introduced by Cornwallis, his unjustifiable methods for forcing the Acadians, against their will, to cross the frontier, deserve to be condemned by every one, and especially by the Acadians." This, from the pen of a Catholic writer, is surely a more effective as well as a more historical judgment than all Parkman's hysterical rhetoric. M. Richard, however, clears up two important points of which Parkman offers no explanation; first, that the Abbé Le Loutre was *not* a missionary on English territory—which wholly changes the complexion of his conduct in endeavoring to induce the Acadians to emigrate; secondly, that he was *not*, as Parkman calls him, "Vicar-General of Acadia." M. Richard concludes:[3] "Le Loutre's faults, to my thinking, are attributable rather to his ill-balanced mind than to a disordered will. Like all men of one idea, he was ignorant of the world and unsuited to the governance of men." He adds: ". . . We know that on several occasions he saved the lives of English officers; . . . that after the deportation and his return to France he became a ministering angel to the Acadian refugees, that he devoted his time and his money to the alleviation of their lot." A portrait certainly truer to nature than the American chronicler's highly-colored caricature.

In 1752, Cornwallis, of whom M. Richard says that he had had "the good sense to return from the error of his ways,"[4] quitted Acadia, and was succeeded, unfortunately, only temporarily, by Peregrine Thomas Hopson, formerly commander-in-chief at Louisbourg. After fifteen months, however, he also left the Colony, in November, 1753, as if he, says Rameau de Saint-Père,[5] "like his predecessor, had been frightened and disgusted by the prospect which the future presented."

The Acadians had been disturbed not only by the long conflicts concerning the oath of allegiance, but also by events consequent on the foundation of Halifax. The English colonists "showed a violent irritation against the Acadians, and openly invited the Governor to take the most extreme measures against

[1] P. 257. [2] P. 259. [3] P. 267. [4] Vol. i., p. 319. [5] II., p. 149.

them."[1] It is, as the same writer observes, a fact often to be remarked in the history of a conquered country, that "the civilian immigration, which follows the victorious army, shows itself more unjust, more oppressive towards the invaded people, than the soldiers themselves." Everything, in fact, was preparing for the consummation of the crowning act of tyrannical injustice.

On the 17th of September, 1754, Major Charles Lawrence—originally a house-painter's apprentice—was definitely named Governor of Nova Scotia, "in spite," says Rameau de Saint-Père, "of the little sympathy he inspired in the Board of Plantations,"[2] who, the same author believes, by no means wished to see him in that position, fearing, as they did, the effects of his violent character. He was anything but popular with the people of Halifax;[3] appears, in fact, to have possessed all the faults of the "ranker" suddenly raised to supreme power for which he is not fit. It is upon him, as Abbé Casgrain says, of all others, "that the responsibility rests for the deportation of the Acadians."[4]

He began by a letter to the Lords of Trade, dated August 1, 1754[5]—that is, before his formal instalment as Governor—in which he throws doubts on the genuineness of their neutrality, adding, significantly, that "*they possess the best and largest tracts of land in this Province*," thereby preventing its final "settlement" by English colonists. He hints, plainly, that "*it would be much better*, if they refuse the oath, (!) *that they* were away," but professes, of course, that he would not think of taking action of any kind without their Lordships' approbation.

The next step was to deprive the Acadians of their arms and ammunition,[6] that is, to stir up overt resistance, if he possibly could, so as to justify (?) any severities he might be "forced" to exercise, in consequence. The Acadians, however, disappointed him by quietly giving up their arms, in compliance with his autocratic demand. In June, 1755, although war had not been formally declared, Fort Beausejour, on the Isthmus between the Bay of Fundy and Green Bay—"which singularly favored the communications of the Acadians with the French of Canada"[7]—was attacked and ultimately taken by Monckton, the Acadians, including those who had taken refuge on French territory, refusing, almost to a man, and in spite of threats and cajoleries, to assist the French. Yet these were the "dangerous" people whom Lawrence thought would be "better away."

"That Lawrence had by this time determined on the deportation is, I think, clear enough."[8] "From the moment that the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 150.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 150, 151.
[3] Richard, i., p. 343.
[4] P. 123.
[5] Richard, i., pp. 355, 356.
[6] Casgrain, p. 124.
[7] Rameau, ii., p. 151.
[8] Richard, i., p. 263.

taking of Fort Beausejour . . . . rendered the expulsion of the Acadians possible," writes Abbé Casgrain,[1] "and that their disarming had removed one of the greatest obstacles, the Government of Nova Scotia was actively occupied in putting this project into execution." Rameau de Saint-Père's assertion,[2] already alluded to, that the whole thing had been planned ever since 1720, is a piece of Anglophobe calumny which is certainly not borne out by the facts.[3]

For the expulsion itself—of which "Evangeline" gives but a faint idea, and as to the details of which all the authorities referred to are as one—the time was, indeed, singularly "favorable," if such an expression be permissible. England and France were engaged, in America, in that deadly frontier struggle of which Parkman, in his "Half Century of Conflict," has given us such a vivid description. Braddock had just been defeated (July 9th) near Fort Duquesne.[4] It was therefore only too easy to stir up the hatred of the New England troops—who were to be the chief agents of the deportation[5]—against the "Papists" of Acadia—whose lands they were to possess. Lawrence, in fact, resolved to take advantage of the panic caused by Braddock's defeat in order to bring matters to a speedy conclusion; to take advantage, also, of the fact that war was raging, in order to justify his disobedience to the distinct and definite orders he had received from the Lords of Trade not to molest the Acadians. This point, the non-complicity

[1] P. 128. [2] Vol. ii., p. 36.

[3] M. Richard (vol. i., p. 375) gives the following summary of the eleven "subterfuges" by which the Governors endeavored to prevent the Acadians from leaving the country:

"First subterfuge (VETCH)—You shall not depart before Nicholson's return.

"Second subterfuge (NICHOLSON)—You shall not depart till after such and such points shalt have been decided by the Queen.

"Third subterfuge (VETCH)—You shall not depart in English vessels.

"Fourth subterfuge (VETCH)—You shall not depart in French vessels.

"Fifth subterfuge (VETCH)—You cannot procure rigging at Louisbourg.

"Sixth subterfuge (VETCH)—You cannot procure rigging at Boston.

"Seventh subterfuge (VETCH)—You shall not depart in your own vessels.

"Eighth subterfuge (PHILIPPS)—You shall not make roads to depart by.

"1730—Restricted oath accepted.

"1749—Your oath is worthless.

"Ninth subterfuge (CORNWALLIS)—You shall not depart this autumn.

"Tenth subterfuge (CORNWALLIS)—You shall not depart till after you have sown your fields.

"Eleventh subterfuge (CORNWALLIS)—You shall not depart without passports."

To which must be added Lawrence's threat (1755) of *military execution* against the *families* of those who should leave the country without his permission. The whole history of the Acadians, from the Treaty of Utrecht to their final expulsion, is contained in this brief record, which surely decides, once for all, which account is the true one, Longfellow's (that is, M. Richard's) or Parkman's—as endorsed by the "Compiler" and by Goldwin Smith.

[4] Rameau, ii., p. 153. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

of the home authorities, is again proved to demonstration by M. Richard.

Moreover, "the entire line of forts and the northern border of Nova Scotia had fallen into the hands of the English,"[1] so that the Acadians, even should they offer any resistance, could look for no assistance from their compatriots in Canada. "Under these circumstances," the same writer continues, "it is hard to explain, in the light of the present century, the extreme measures decided on by the Governor and Council."

Hard, but not wholly impossible. Lawrence was undoubtedly pressed by the English colonists of Halifax to deport the Acadians, in order that their lands might become "available for settlement." That is one motive for his conduct; that of the Haligonians was due to greed as much as to religious and racial hatred. But even such a pressure is not, in any sense, an "adequate" motive for Lawrence's conduct.

M. Richard charges him, *tout court*, with "interested motives" (personal);[2] because, as he says,[3] "all the precautions he took to hide his projects from the Lords of Trade show that he was playing a risky game, where the stake must have been tempting enough to counterbalance the risk he was about to run." This seems a reasonable inference; men like Lawrence do not "take chances," as the Americans say, unless they expect to profit very materially by doing so.

This stake was, so M. Richard asserts, *the cattle of the Acadians*, of which they possessed, as Lawrence was well aware, an enormous number. His frequent allusions, in his instructions to the officers charged with the deportation, to the cattle of the inhabitants;[4] his evident anxiety concerning what was, certainly, a very probable source of wealth; his strenuous injunctions that the Acadians must be prevented from carrying them off, all point to the same conclusion. It was an age in which fortunes were being made by conquest and by high-handed confiscations; Lawrence was just the man to carry out such a project. Failing that, what motive had he?

Of the actual expulsion, with all its treacheries, cruelties, miseries and sufferings, who that has read "Evangeline" needs to be told? M. Richard, following previous authorities, enters, in his second volume, into the fullest possible details, which he has collated from all the most reliable sources. He also tells at length the history of the Acadian wanderings subsequent to the banishment of this ill-fated people. Here, again, his account is only an extension, in sober but most telling prose, of Longfellow's

---

[1] Smith, p. 198. [2] Vol. ii., p. 4. [3] P. 30. [4] Richard, ii., pp. 58, 59, 60.

pathetic "legend," which is thereby proved to be a simple narrative of facts.

M. Richard has, in fact, rendered a very material service to the student of history. He has shown us the Acadians as they were; their faults and their virtues; shown how they were tricked, deceived, oppressed, and finally banished, to gratify race hatred and private greed. Most of all, he has laid the blame, once for all, on the shoulders of those who are really responsible, for which Englishmen have cause to be sincerely grateful. England's colonial history contains many a record of which her sons have good cause to be ashamed; but as to this crying act of consummate cruelty and injustice—the expulsion of the Acadians—M. Richard has, undoubtedly, amply proved her innocence. We would commend his volumes to the careful study of all those to whom historical truth, as distinguished from partisanship or prejudice, is of the first importance.

FRANCIS W. GREY.

SPAIN AND CUBA.

THE attitude of the greater portion of the press of the United States towards Spain since the beginning of the insurrection in Cuba is very remarkable, not to say discreditable. From the moment when a band of Cubans rose in arms, the greater part of the papers of New York, including even the "Sun," which usually has some pretensions to accuracy in its statements, have filled their columns with fierce attacks on the Government of Spain, and appeals to popular prejudice for the armed interference of the United States in the Cuban Civil War. Civil wars, unfortunately, are not uncommon in other parts of this continent. There is one in Brazil at present, another in Guatemala, and a third in Hayti. In each of these, charges of oppression and massacre are freely made by both sides, but the American Press and Congress feel no inclination to interfere. The same was the case when the Manitoba French half-breeds took arms for the defence of their independence against annexation by Canada, on our northern borders. The execution of Riel excited only a very languid interest in our American journals. It is different in the case of the Cuban insurrection, though. As far as can be gathered from the self-contradicting statements that pass for Cuban intelligence, the great majority of the insurgents in that island are even more widely different in race from our population than the Metis of the Red River. Any story, however absurd, seems good enough as an argument against the Spanish Government. The plundering of a plantation or village is described as a heroic achievement, when done by Cuban negroes. A Cuban is given his liberty at the request of the United States, on his solemn promise not to bear arms against the Government which released him. He breaks his word with the open approval of a large part of the American press. Congress is asked to vote an appropriation for the relief of Americans in Cuba, who are alleged by the representatives of the American people to be in danger of death from Spanish tyranny. The Consul-General reports the statement a rank falsehood; but the sensational journals take no notice of the denial, and continue their work of false charges against a country in friendly relations with our own, with undiminished vigor. It is curious that some of the most ardent patrons of the negro insurgents in Cuba come from States where the interference of negroes in politics is regarded as little short of a crime against civilized government. Whence comes the difference between insurgents

in Cuba and insurgents in Brazil, Guatemala or Manitoba, that the people of this country should be called on to support the one and leave the others to their fate?

It is certainly not because Spanish rule in Cuba is a new thing, or an aggression on distinctively American people.

The Monroe Doctrine has been invoked as a reason for armed interference by the United States, by gentlemen who have either forgotten or never knew what the Monroe Doctrine is. President Monroe's declaration that the policy of this country is opposed to any acquisition of territory on this continent by foreign powers simply means that the governments of Europe shall not be permitted to seize on American territory as so many of them have recently partitioned the African continent among themselves in utter disregard of the rights of the natives. The Spanish West Indies have been a portion of the Spanish domains since the days of Columbus, and their population is wholly derived from Spain or Africa. They were as much a part of Spanish territory at the time of President Monroe's famous enunciation, as the Canaries or the Balearic Islands, and they are so still. With Spain the United States have no grounds for quarrel or complaint. Spain helped us to establish our independence of England, and subsequently increased our territory by the peaceful cession of the Floridas. It has never trespassed on our rights or shown hostility to our institutions, as other European powers have done. The execution of Crittenden and his filibusters forty-five years ago, and of the crew of the Virginius during the last Cuban insurrection, were acts of self-defence on Spanish soil, like the execution of Walker in Honduras and of Raosset de Balbon in Mexico. It seems worth examining what are the real motives for this desire for the overthrow of Spanish government in Cuba at the present time.

It can hardly be seriously thought, though it may be proclaimed on platforms, that any real sympathy with the people of Cuba, or any sense of wrongs endured by them, is the cause of this anxiety for a war with Spain. Cubans and Spaniards are of the same race, and members of a common nationality under a common government. The subjects of quarrel between them are of a domestic nature, much the same as those between the Northern and Southern States in our own civil war. It is not a case in which a foreign conqueror has deprived a nation of its liberty and rules it, regardless of the rights and wishes of its people, as Russia in Poland, or Turkey in Greece. The feelings of human nature in struggles under such conditions sympathize with the oppressed, but where a civil war breaks out in a long united community no such cause for sympathy with either exists. It may be alleged, but as a matter of fact it is not genuine. The warm sympathy professed by

the largest part of the English population for the South, during our own struggle, had its origin not in any desire to see the condition of the American people improved, nor any special admiration of negro slavery, but purely in the selfish desire to see the power of the United States in the world materially weakened as a rival of England. The same can be said of England's action towards the Spanish American colonies when they separated from the home government. The people of this country have, however, no fear of Spanish aggression or rivalry, so we must look further to find a cause, if not a reason, for the feeling against Spain manifested by a large part of our population in this matter as in others.

Among Americans of English origin a latent dislike of Spain and the Spaniards is an inheritance from England. The English people, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, were trained to a national hatred of the French and Spaniards above other European races. Dislike of the Catholic religion formed a large element in this feeling. It was the Protestant tradition which, from the days of Elizabeth, was inculcated by its rulers on the English population, that both the religion and the government of England were the best in the world, and that the Catholic nations of Europe were alike idolatrous and slavish.

"I hate the French because they are all slaves and wear wooden shoes," is the sentiment which, in the last century, Sterne puts in the mouth of an English sailor, as he tells of his experience with a British press-gang which "first knocked me down, then ordered me to stand." The Spaniards, if less often in conflict with England than the French, were regarded as even more strongly Catholic, and so shared in the popular English dislike. The feelings of the English population were, to a great degree, transmitted to the English colonies in this country. The Revolution, when French soldiers secured the establishment of American Independence, partly, but only partly, dispelled it. It still exists in a latent form with regard to Spain and the Spaniards, and it breaks out in open expression on favorable occasions such as the present. It is neither American nor republican in the true sense.

The desire for territorial extension, regardless of the rights of others, is another inheritance of English sentiments. It is not so prevalent now as in the times before the late war, which gave our people a much clearer idea than they before possessed of what war and its consequences really are. From the days of Aaron Burr to the final overthrow of negro slavery, the forcible conquest of new territory was a favorite idea for reckless Americans. Filibustering expeditions like those of Walker and Crittenden were looked on with much popular favor, especially in the Southern

States, where the Anglo-Saxon element is more largely predominant than in the Northern States. Burr's ambitious project of founding an empire for himself in Mexico opened the eyes of all honest American statesmen to the dangers for the internal freedom of our country in a policy of foreign aggression. It was felt that the maintenance of republican institutions at home would be seriously imperilled by copying the aggressive foreign policy of England and other European monarchies. As a rule, non-interference with the rights of those outside our own boundaries has since been maintained by America as a nation. Thanks to it, in great measure, popular institutions have been maintained in the United States for over a century, contrary to the experience of most other republics, such as Holland, Florence, the Hanse Towns, and the various French republican governments from 1791 to 1850. The desire for foreign conquests found vent in private expeditions against Central America and Mexico, which, from the close of the Mexican War down to the secession, were decidedly popular. Since the latter event, the "jingo" spirit has notably declined in this country. We hear much less of "manifest destiny" and the other vague expressions which are used to disguise the injustice of unprovoked wars on weaker peoples. The spirit, however, still exists. We find plenty of Americans who speak admiringly of England's fondness for seizing the lands of weaker nations, and regret the more honest policy of our own government. To such men the seizure of Alexandria or Corinto, or the levying tribute on Guatemala or Venezuela by the right of the strongest guns, appears something heroic and masterful. They wonder why our own government, with the undoubted power, displays no will to "go and do likewise" by seizing what is not its own. Like the Highland cattle-thief of former days,

> "The good old rule suffices them—the simple plan
> That they shall take who have the power,
> And they shall keep who can."

This class finds expression in irresponsible calls for intervention in Cuba, regardless of any law but that of the strongest; and sensation-seeking journalists find ready readers when they echo the cry. Neither the policy advocated nor the motives which suggest the advocacy are such as to recommend themselves to honest minds.

In the present Cuban struggle, as in our own Civil War, fair-minded men will consider it a matter to be left for settlement to the parties directly interested. The law of right is the only safe guide for nations as for men, and it is the same for the weak as for the strong. That patriotic Spaniards should object to the secession

of Cuba is as natural as it was for patriotic citizens of this country to object to the secession of South Carolina. The secessionists of that State believed as fully in their right to establish an independent government of their own as the most ardent Cuban does to-day; but it by no means followed that other nations were prepared to recognize the Palmetto flag side by side with the Stars and Stripes. Spain, though a single nation in its dealings with the rest of the world since the days of Ferdinand and Isabella, is more like the United States in its political system of distinct local and central authorities than almost any other European country. Aragon and Castile, Biscay and Navarre, Catalunia and the Balearic Islands were each regarded as distinct kingdoms during the time of Spain's greatest power. Each had its own laws, its own Cortes, and its separate constitution, while united into one nation by the bond of a central government. The *fueros*, or "rights," of the different Spanish provinces or kingdoms, as the custom was to style them, were as jealously guarded against the encroachments of the central power of the crown as "State rights" in our own country are against Federal usurpations. Since the Carlist Cristino war, that followed the death of Ferdinand II., the power of the central authority in Spain has been much increased at the expense of the provincial *fueros*, but the latter are still cherished by the people. The last Carlist war was really more a struggle for the State rights of Biscay and Navarre than for an individual sovereign. The Basque mountaineers and fishermen, accustomed to the fullest self-government under the Spanish monarchy, cared little whether the ruler at Madrid were king or president, so long as he left them free to regulate their own affairs. The Radicals, who seized on the government after the flight of Isabella II., attempted to suppress the local self-governments of the Basque provinces, and the Basque people at once rose in arms and rallied around Don Carlos. The older war of the Spanish succession, in the beginning of the last century, gives another instance of attachment to local State rights. Catalunia had always enjoyed a freer constitution than Castile, and when the French candidate for the throne was installed at Madrid he wished to introduce a uniform administration into his dominions on the pattern of the then French monarchy. The Austrian candidate swore fealty to the Catalan State rights, and the Catalans defended both vigorously, even after the Peace of Utrecht had left them to brave the united forces of Spain and France. The combination of loyalty to the nation with loyalty to provincial rights in separate spheres is thus traditional in Spain. Spanish sentiment resents any dismemberment of the national territory as jealously as American patriotism demands the maintenance of our own national unity. It is a

feeling which Americans, above any other people, can readily comprehend, and to which we cannot refuse respect.

To the great body of the Spanish people Cuba and Puerto Rico are as much a part of Spain as California is of the United States. Havana is not farther from Madrid than San Francisco is from Washington. The people of Cuba, apart from the negro element, are the same in race with the natives of the peninsula. They speak the same language, share a common literature and religion, and have been for three centuries under a common government and institutions. A revolt in Cuba is in Spanish eyes as much a civil war as a revolt in Biscay or Catalunia. In Mexico or Peru the population, though Spanish in language, is only partly Spanish in blood; but in the West Indies there is practically no admixture of Indian races with the European settlers. Hence in Spain the relation between the West Indian islands and the mother-land is regarded with very different feelings from those of conquest or rule in foreign lands. The Cubans are regarded as a part of the Spanish people, and their separation from Spain would be looked on as a national dismemberment.

It is, under the circumstances, very difficult for an outsider to decide whether the outbreak in Cuba has motives sufficiently well-grounded to justify it or not. It is said that the Spanish Government is tyrannical and ill-administered, that the revenues of Cuba are drawn away from the island without any return, and that official posts are filled in undue proportion with natives of Spain. These grievances may be real or they may be exaggerated; but they are such as are made in every country of wide extent. Similar complaints from time to time are made in different sections of even these United States. It is often claimed that the interests of the West or South are sacrificed to those of the Eastern States, and charges of reckless expenditure of the public revenues are not unknown amongst us. It is not so long since an enthusiastic Governor threatened to ride to Washington ankle-deep in blood in the supposed interests of his State, which could not find a market for its silver under the financial policy approved by the Federal Government. We mention these facts to indicate that complaints on the part of sections of a country are not necessarily proofs that its government is radically bad. Cuban discontent may be justified by the facts, but we have so far seen no clear and reliable statement of facts which would warrant the condemnation of the Spanish government as outside the pale of international right or make us believe that the establishment of an independent Cuba would be a gain for the human race or the Cuban people.

Civil war is one of the gravest misfortunes for any nation, and as well-wishers of mankind, and of the Spanish race in particular,

we must regard its outbreak in Cuba with deep regret. The objects to be attained by such a war must be of the most important and urgent nature to justify its commencement. Where a nation, already possessed of a national organization, throws off the rule of a foreign power, the gain of national freedom may well be worth the struggle, as in the case of our own country, of Belgium sixty years ago, or of Greece. When part of the population in a hitherto united nation, however, undertakes to change existing institutions by armed force, the result very rarely compensates for the shock to the public welfare. The Huguenot wars in France and the Thirty Years' War in Germany can only be regarded as public disasters unredeemed by any gain. Spain and the Spanish settlements in America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were freer from internal disturbances than almost any other nation. The reverse has been the case in this century, and the consequences to the whole Spanish race have been most disastrous. Within a few years after the victorious struggle against Napoleon's invasion, a military enthusiast, Riego, undertook to give Spain a new constitution by the help of the army, and succeeded in doing so in 1820, only to have it overthrown the following year by the Conservative party in Spain, supported by a French army. The death of Ferdinand a few years later was the signal for a new outbreak of civil war on the constitutional question whether women could inherit the crown of Spain, under the Bourbon dynasty. It took several bitter years of civil war to settle this question, and the contest practically made the army the supreme power of the Government of Spain. In 1869 General Prim, the favorite of the military, thought fit to expel Isabella II. and call a brother of the King of Italy to the throne of Spain. His reign was brief, and was the signal for a new Carlist war, which was waged for years with unparalleled obstinacy in the northern provinces, while republican governments on various systems were being tried and abandoned in quick succession in Madrid. After years of turmoil, the commander of the army in Madrid called the son of Isabella II. to occupy the throne, and after six years of bloodshed and confusion the government was established on the same form as in 1869. The lesson of the results of civil warfare is a striking one for hot-headed patriots.

The Spanish colonies on this continent followed the example of Spain. Their connection with the central government had been loosened by the intrusion of a French puppet king on the Spanish throne, and the revolution of Riego was the signal for nearly every Spanish colony on the continent of America to set up a government of its own. The conditions of Spanish America were very different from those under which these United States shook off the

yoke of England. Here, the colonies were in the possession of fully organized governments of their own, and their reason for separating from England was a definite grievance, the new claim of the Parliament to tax America without its own consent. It was a confederacy of States fighting for their rights as States, not an uprising of crowds to form States out of unorganized populations. Throughout Spanish America the revolt was of a very different character. Individuals of more or less influence in the various provinces drew up different systems of government, and called the people to arms to put them into execution. Juntas, provisional assemblies and military dictators assumed the functions of government by their own appointment. There was no common concert between the different colonies. Mexico became successively an empire and a republic. Guatemala, which formed a part of the original Mexico since Aztec days, separated its lot from the rest of the viceroyalty, and eventually divided itself into five petty states, independent of each other and of all the world. The Peru of Spanish days split into the republics of Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador. Buenos Ayres, with a million and a half of people, found three separate governments necessary in its independent existence; and the original republic of Colombia finally resolved itself into three more.

It is needless to follow the dreary details of revolution and aimless wars which have marked the history of Spanish America for half a century. One illustration may be given to show the result to the populations involved. When Humboldt visited Mexico, at the beginning of this century, he estimated its population at six millions, and that, at its then rate of increase, it would double itself in nineteen years. Such a growth would have given Mexico to-day a larger native population than the United States has, while in fact it is scarcely a fifth of that number.

Florid proclamations are but poor compensation for human lives. Spain itself, in the reign of Charles III., was the third power in the world. To-day, she is no longer reckoned among the great powers of Europe. During the first Carlist war the population of the Peninsula sank from thirteen and a half millions in 1830 to little over twelve millions in 1846. The Spanish race, both in Europe and America, is now slowly recovering from the effects of its half-century of civil wars. Spain has increased its population to eighteen millions, and Mexico, at length, shows signs of returning progress for the first time since its proclamation of independence. The governments of nearly all Spanish America are gradually assuming stability in a greater or less degree. The responsibility of stirring up new war among such a race is, indeed, a grave one, and its cause has need to be weighty, indeed, for justification.

That the people of Cuba have grievances under their existing government may be quite true, but the reasonable way to examine the question is, are they better or worse off materially, morally and intellectually than the Spanish-American peoples who possess independent governments of their own? Are the laws more fairly administered, is public education further advanced, are the mass of the people better fed and clothed, is the public wealth greater in Venezuela, or Guatemala, or New Granada, than in Cuba? These are the questions which should be determined before one could fairly pronounce in favor of the separation of Cuba from Spain. We have not seen any attempt to make such a comparison on the part of the partisans of the Cuban insurgents; and we do not believe that, if made, it would warrant any friend of humanity in urging on a murderous war for the sake of adding another small state to the existing family of Spanish-American republics. A fair comparison may be made with one within a few miles of the Cuban shores. San Domingo is next to Cuba in size among the West Indies, and, during the last century, it was regarded as of greater commercial and material importance than the larger island. It has now enjoyed independent government for the best part of a century, but the outside world is not aware of any marked progress yet made in the island during that time. Leaving out of consideration the negro republic of Hayti, as involving other race questions, the Spanish republic of San Domingo is nearly equal in extent to half Cuba, and it possesses even greater natural resources of soil and climate. It now maintains a population of little over six hundred thousand in what is certainly not a state of marked prosperity, on a territory of eighteen thousand square miles. Its political history has been mainly a chronicle of petty wars and personal ambitions, and at the present time its revenues are literally farmed out to a syndicate of foreign capitalists—not a very brilliant instance of capacity for self-government. The population of Cuba, on somewhat like twice the territory of San Domingo, is over a million and a half, and, in intellectual and material development, Cuba, under Spanish rule, is far ahead of San Domingo.

The revenue of San Domingo is estimated at somewhat over three million dollars, that of Cuba about twenty-five millions. Nearly half the revenues of the latter country are expended on the debt resulting from the last insurrection. Serious as this burthen undoubtedly is, a successful revolution could hardly lighten, though it might do much to aggravate it. Puerto Rico, which has escaped, almost alone of Spanish American countries, the curse of civil war, is an illustration of what is possible under Spanish rule. It maintains a population of eight hundred thousand on a territory of three

thousand two hundred square miles, or in other words a population nearly as dense as that of Massachusetts, and to all appearance fully as contented if not as wealthy a one. It makes a far better showing in this respect than the old Spanish colonies of Jamaica and Trinidad, which have been for generations under British rule. Cuba itself, with its five years of insurrectionary war, has piled up less of a debt than the British colony of New Zealand, with one-third of the population of Cuba, has accumulated in twenty-five years of self-administration. The English, French and Spanish nations have all tried the experiment of colonization in the West Indies, and at the present time the prosperity of the Spanish colonies is undoubtedly greater than that of either of their rivals. The Spanish government is not an ideal one, but it has shown itself at least as good as any other system yet tried in the West Indies. Declamatory phrases about "foreign domination," "patriotic Cubans" and "republican institutions" are not sufficient warrant for honest men outside Cuba to engage in any crusade for its overthrow by arms.

The history of nearly every country of Spanish-America is sufficient proof that sonorous phrases on the part of politicians are no guarantee of genuine liberty. There has been scarcely a year in which governments, republican as well as monarchical, have not been assailed by armed rebellion under color of florid proclamations. Liberty and loyalty, national unity and individual rights, the maintenance of order and the need of progress, have all furnished pretexts for civil war in which the ambition of individuals has been the real motive. That civil war is one of the greatest evils that can befall a nation is an undoubted fact; that the preponderance of any leader in Spanish-America has been a distinct gain to the country is more than doubtful. The warrior politicians seem to have followed the practice of Dugald Dalgetty as summed up by himself in Scott's "Legend of Montrose." "Excellent cries, all; I will not undertake to say which is the better; but I know I have waded knee-deep in blood for causes ten times worse than any of them." The readiness to wade knee-deep in blood, rather than undertake the task of deciding upon the real merits of a cause, finds a parallel in Cuba as in other Spanish-American lands.

To an outsider desirous of the welfare of both Cuba and Spain, it looks as if the best solution of the present struggle would be the establishment of Home Rule for local affairs in the island without sundering its connection with the Spanish Government. This solution the fall of the Azacarraga Ministry and the advent of the Liberals seem to promise. The Spanish people are not unfamiliar, as has already been pointed out, with the practice of subordinate State governments. Down to the close of Isabella II.'s

reign, the Basque provinces of Biscay had a totally distinct administration from the rest of Spain, even in matters which in our government are regarded as belonging exclusively to the domain of the Federal authority. Thus the customs and the military conscription were different in the Basque provinces from what they were in Castile. The old provincial governments of Spain have been nearly destroyed by the centralization of power during the late civil wars. The establishment of Home Rule in Cuba might lead to a revival of Home Rule in Catalunia and Valencia as well. If it should, Spain might have reason to be grateful at no distant day for even the present insurrection. BRYAN J. CLINCH.

THE TOTAL ABSTINENCE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

ONE of the most marked features of modern American life is the "Total Abstinence Movement." It is in active progress, both within the Church and without. Large and influential numbers in the country which has had its "Whiskey Wars," which has so long boasted of its Kentucky and Monongahela products, and which has welcomed the importation of breweries, seem to begin to turn away from, if not altogether demolish, those gods whom they once adored. The American people are becoming year by year more temperate in the use of alcoholic drinks, and temperance is rapidly becoming synonymous, to their mind, with total abstinence. Outside the Church, for the most part, there is a political party which aims at banishing alcoholic drink from this country as effectually as St. Patrick is said to have banished the serpent from Ireland. But the Prohibition Party finds that strong drink is more racy of this soil and has far stronger proprietary rights than the snakes of the Green Isle. What with the fat taxes poured into municipal and State treasuries, what with the big sums contributed to political campaign funds, the liquor-dealers have far too strong a hold on the powers that be to permit such legislation as would make a clean sweep of their business. Nor would impartial thinkers be inclined to consider such wholesale legislation wise or just, under existing circumstances. Still the Prohibition Party has secured a large amount of success; and although it is asserted that it never reaches its ideal, yet it must be granted that it has done much good in many localities.

There is another organization, or, more properly, series of organizations, outside the Church, which, without going as far as the Prohibitionists, are very active in promoting total abstinence. These organizations are composed chiefly of what are called "religious people," that is, of the most active members of various sects. They push the question of total abstinence very far—so far, indeed, that they seem to make of it a sort of new commandment, including all "the law and the prophets." They have ostracized alcoholic drinks from social gatherings, and some sects make total abstinence a *sine qua non* condition for accepting ministers of religion. Much of the success of the movement among non-Catholics is due to the activity and influence of its female apostles.

Within the Catholic Church in the United States there is a strong organization, known as the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, which has existed in its present organized form for more than a quarter of a century, and which claims a membership of many thousands, gathered from all parts of the country. Its stronghold has been and is the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, which is so fruitful in all manner of good works. It has received much encouragement from both clergy and laity. The Holy Father has declared its method to be the "best" or (if we consider the word *optimum* a *superlativo assoluto*) a "very good" remedy for intemperance. Prominent members of the hierarchy have endorsed it; many of the most zealous and learned of the clergy are among its leaders; and the rank and file of its members compare favorably in intelligence and influence with the membership of other organizations. The generally high character of the membership of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union may be accounted for by the fact that it aims not only at embettering the manhood and social position of its members, but, further and especially, at developing their supernatural life. Indeed this is its distinguishing feature. Hence Catholic total abstainers are, as a rule, frequenters of the Sacraments and good church members in every respect.

The work of these several organizations constitutes what may be called the Total Abstinence Movement. It ought to prove interesting to consider the causes which have brought this movement into existence, the results it has already achieved, the obstacles it has to overcome, and the attitude which right-thinking men ought to hold towards it. This we shall endeavor to do.

In considering the cause of this movement, it would not be correct to ascribe it to any particularly excessive tendency for intoxicants on the part of the American people. They have not exceeded in this respect the customs of other peoples of the same latitude. The total abstinence movement may be ascribed rather to the practical common sense of the American people, set in

motion by the effects of an advanced material civilization. One of the immediate results of so-called higher civilization is an abnormal development of the nervous system. The keener competitions for livelihood, the higher standard of requirements for success, the increased strain on mental powers, the worry and anxiety attendant on great operations—these and other conditions of material progress lead to the undue tension of the nerves. This excessive exercise of the nervous system interferes seriously with the lower functions of the human organism, and tends to destroy the equilibrium of vital activities on which physical, and, in a large measure, mental well-being depends. A peculiar characteristic of a high-strung nervous system is that it seeks comfort and solace, not in calm and rest, but in still further excitement. This tendency constitutes the marked affinity for alcoholic beverage which is noticeable in the most highly-developed nervous organisms. The brain which is in a high state of activity seeks to have its activity strengthened by the use of alcoholic stimulants; the body which is feverish with exertion clamors to brace up and prolong its energies by the exciting draught; the heart whose beatings have been over-multiplied by excitement demands a continuance of its ruinous pace from blood set a-boiling by the fire-water. If this tendency is yielded to, if alcoholic stimulants are added to the high pressure caused by environment, it becomes a case of heaping Pelion on Ossa; the nervous system collapses, and bears down in its ruin the entire organism. American common sense has taken cognizance of these conditions and effects of modern life in this climate, and has adopted, to a very considerable extent, what experience points out to be the best, though somewhat drastic, remedy—Total Abstinence. The shrewd American business man knows that he cannot drink stimulants and, at the same time, attend properly to the exacting requirements of his business.

With from eight to ten hours' close application every day, with ever-recurring new methods and enterprises arising around him, with competition becoming closer and closer, the American business or professional man feels that he is under as much strain as his system can bear, and that to increase it by the use of artificial stimulants would eventually culminate in reaction and utter breakdown, leaving him by the wayside. The skilled mechanic perceives that he needs a cool head and steady hand to fulfil the complicated and responsible task which American inventive genius has confided to him. Employees of all kinds have learnt that unimpeachable sobriety is the surest, and in most cases the only, way to gain the confidence of their employers.

And thus the desire to succeed in life and the consciousness that success is utterly incompatible in this order of civilization

with insobriety is one of the chief causes that has led the average American into the temperance movement. Nor is it any excess of enthusiasm that has urged him to prosecute temperance to the extreme limit of total abstinence. He has come to this conclusion by a logical process of reasoning. If the great danger and difficulty of modern life arises from the over-stimulation of the nervous system, then the remedy lies not in adding moderate extraneous fuel to the flames but in withdrawing such fuel altogether.

The Total Abstinence Movement has already achieved very noticeable results. The serving of alcoholic beverages, and even of wines, is ceasing to be good form in the best society. The *menu* of banquets and festive reunions no longer, to the same extent as heretofore, blazons the choice products of the still or the wine-press. Visits are made and received without reference to the side-board and corkscrew. Business and professional men are to be found in larger numbers, day by day, at their occupation with no traces of over-night libations. The working man is growing in self-respect and comfort, in proportion as he is eschewing the saloon. The pernicious system of "treating" no longer obtains as of old. Even the professional politicians are ceasing to have recourse to it. The municipal boss finds that he can and must succeed without the aid of alcohol; the actual President of the Republic has ordered that no wine shall be served on his official table.

To an extent unknown among other peoples of northern latitudes, large numbers of Americans are to be seen in hotels, on ocean steamers, at business conventions, on excursions, enjoying themselves fully yet rationally, transacting momentous business calmly and efficiently, without the accompaniment of strong drink, and without the noise and contention, the blustering and bickering that usually follow in its wake.

Gradually public opinion is being formed in favor of total abstinence. Its votaries no longer find themselves obliged to apologize for their practice, or to make lengthy arguments in its favor. A man can now be a total abstainer without exposing himself to be considered a crank, and without subjecting himself to the insinuation that his teetotalism is due to reaction from excess. Yea, he finds himself all the more respected and influential because of his being a total abstainer.

This marked change in public opinion and practice with reference to total abstinence has been effected in the face of many difficulties and much opposition. The Total Abstinence Movement has had to contend, in the first place, with the craving for strong drink which is a characteristic of northern races. Alcohol is undoubtedly agreeable to most palates in these climates. It re-

joiceth the heart, contributes to good fellowship, spurs the flagging energies, drowns the worrying cares, is an apparent panacea for opposite inconveniences, is cooling against heat and warming against cold, and is to many the one thing without which life is not worth living.

This appetite for strong drink has been fostered by unwise State legislation and by the beneficiaries of such legislation—the brewers, distillers, and liquor-dealers. There is no measuring the influence, whether collectively or individually, of those engaged in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages. State legislatures cannot resist their bribes; and even high and holy places do not prove impervious to the *douce violence* of their generosity.

But the most serious opposition of all has come to total abstinence from that very large and very exultant body of people known as "moderate drinkers." It is not easy to define by mode of limitation in what moderate drinking consists, but it is here accepted as including all that lies between the "little wine for the stomach's sake" and the short-of-intoxication mark. Moderate drinkers have been very much shocked at the theories and practices of certain total abstainers. Well-instructed Catholics, especially, have looked with mistrust on the apparent dogmatizing connected with the American Total Abstinence Movement—the tendency to regard drunkenness as the one sin and total abstinence the one virtue—the holding up the drinking of alcoholic beverages as wrong and sinful *in se*. Moreover, a large proportion of them came from countries where moderate drinking is the rule and drunkenness the exception; where beer and wine are served not behind closed doors, before a bar, but in comfortable surroundings, before the public gaze, and in respectable company.

It is no easy matter to win over this large and respectable class to the cause of total abstinence. And yet the solid progress of the movement is bound up with success in this particular sphere. Total abstinence can easily argue with drunkenness; it can discredit the opposition of the liquor interests; but it can never take hold of the great body of the people until it receives the hearty concurrence of those heretofore known as moderate drinkers. This important class has been somewhat antagonized in the past by the injudicious language and policy of some over-zealous teetotalers. People will not allow themselves to be dragooned and legislated into the belief that the use of alcoholic drinks is wrong even when no injury to health, or no injustice, or no disedification to one's neighbor follows. Moderate drinkers will not allow themselves to be forced into total abstinence. But it is to be hoped that ever-increasing numbers of them will allow themselves to be reasoned into trying it if it is put fairly before them; and

there can be no doubt that, if they once give it an honest trial, their own experience will confirm them in its practice.

Herein lies the most fruitful field for the future apostolate of the total abstainers. If they succeed in enlisting in their ranks considerable numbers of those who were hitherto classed as moderate drinkers, lasting triumph for the cause of total abstinence will have been secured.

This will be the most effective way of closing the breweries and distilleries, and their offshoots, the saloons; for, once the demand ceases, the supply will not be forthcoming. Now the steadiest demand for strong drink, and the strongest support of the liquor-dealers, comes not from the few who drink to excess, but from the many who claim to drink in moderation. And it is not only by the large quantities consumed that these latter support the liquor business, but especially by their patronage. This patronage is all the more valuable for the liquor-dealers in proportion as those who give it are respectable and influential. It is vain to expect the lower masses to shun the saloons and the adulterated beer and maddening whiskey as long as those whom they naturally look up to as leaders are known to worship in a similar temple under the different name of hotel, or club, or library, and at the same fountain, under a more refined and costly form.

The future development of the Total Abstinence Movement thus depends on the attitude towards it of the influential, the educated, the respectable members of society. There can be no questioning what that attitude should be. If it can be proved that total abstinence is a reasonable practice, that it makes better and happier men, that it enables them to fulfil better their family and social duties, that it helps to make them better and more solid Christians, and that it is for most people in this country the only safeguard of temperance, then it is incumbent on those who are in a position to influence their fellow-men to co-operate in this movement.

Now, all these arguments in favor of total abstinence can readily be made manifest. It is, in the first place, a *reasonable* practice. We may safely conclude that a practice is reasonable if we find, on consideration, that no principle of necessity or utility militates against it, and if, especially, it has solid advantages to recommend it. Science proclaims that the use of alcohol is not necessary for the bodily wants of a person in good health. What is necessary for our existence is sound, blood-producing food and sufficient liquid to dilute it. Alcohol is not only not necessary but useless for supplying these wants. It contains no blood-producing properties, and, as a diluent, it is inferior to water. Ex-

perience comes in to confirm the evidence of science. All those who have given up even moderate drinking, and practiced total abstinence for any considerable time, bear testimony that their health is better without than it ever was with alcoholic drink. The truth is that alcohol is an element entirely extern to our system; it enters into it only as a poison. The prevailing notions about its utility as a nourisher, heater or wholesome stimulant are altogether ill-founded. Of nourishment, alcohol gives absolutely none; of heat-giving properties, it has less than any non-alcoholic warm drink. Science tells us that it even lowers the temperature of the body. As a stimulant, it undoubtedly braces up and excites for the moment, but its use is invariably followed by reaction. The depressed of spirit, no less than the excited, use it to their greater woe. Brain-workers, especially, act wisely in resisting their strong inclination for it. "Of all people I know," said the late Sir H. Thompson, the most eminent authority of our times, "who cannot stand alcohol, the brain-workers can do so least." And another recognized authority, Dr. W. Gull, says: "All alcohol injures the nerve-tissue of the brain; it may quicken the operations, but it does not improve them." Positive experiment has exploded the old notion that alcohol was useful for digestion; it is now known that it rather impedes it. Even French medical authorities recognize that the supposed usefulness of the time-honored *pousse-café* is a fallacy.

Nor can it be maintained any longer, in the light of either science or experience, that the use of alcohol, while neither necessary nor useful, may be considered of indifferent import to health. Alcohol, even when used moderately, is positively injurious to a healthy human system. We say "healthy" because, in case of certain diseases, it may, like other poisons, prove beneficial. It is the most fecund parent of disease of every kind and in every part of the body, from the gouty toe to the bedimmed brain.

But there are other and higher motives than that of bodily health for practicing total abstinence. Man is a composite being, composed of soul and body. The soul is the substantial form of the latter, the principle of man's life, the constituting element that distinguishes him from all other terrestrial creatures. Man is perfect as man in proportion as each of the constituent parts of his being is perfect in itself and in due relation to the other. The old adage—*mens sana in corpore sano*—expresses the perfection of the parts, but it does not touch the more important question of the harmony that should exist between them.

The absence of this harmony in man as known to history, the evident conflict between mind and body, is one of the problems which human philosophy cannot solve. Revelation alone gives

the key to it. Through revelation we discover man coming forth from the hands of his Creator, perfect in every part of his being, with all his physical organism in entire subjection to his soul, and with soul and body together informed by the supernatural principle of Divine Grace. Revelation tells us how the supernatural principle was lost, and how the loss of it entailed the rupture of harmonious relations between the two elements of man's nature; how the lower or animal part of man set itself in revolt against the higher or spiritual. The restoration of Grace through the Incarnate Word of God did not carry with it the restoration of the original harmony between the elements of man's nature. But the work of the Redemption, together with the Divine Life and teachings of the Son of God, has supplied the best means and indicated the best methods for recovering this lost harmony, And thus the most perfect Christian, that is, the man who is most influenced by Divine Grace and by the teachings of the Saviour, is the most perfect man. He approaches nearest the original ideal when man's reason held full sway over his passions, when mind ruled supreme over body, and when both were enlivened and governed by supernatural Grace. Hence the true way to elevate humanity is to bring it more and more under the influence of the Redemption. The sublime privilege "to be and to be called the sons of God" purchased by the Precious Blood of the Eternal Son is the highest goal to which humanity can aspire. Millions of martyrs have shed their blood in witness unto the restoration of this privilege. Millions of confessors have spent themselves in preaching its gospel, and every true man feels an abiding thankfulness for the renewed humanity in himself, and a longing to communicate its blessings to others. And this gratitude and zeal will lead him to avail himself of every praiseworthy means to attain this desired end.

The great glory of total abstinence is that it supplies one of the readiest and most efficient means for perfecting man in the natural sphere, and for preparing him for the influence of the supernatural. In other words, it helps to make better men and better Christians.

Total abstinence certainly perfects the natural elements of manhood, body and mind. It contributes to the health of the body, as we have already seen, makes it less subject to disease, enables it to recover more readily from fatigue; it keeps the blood pure, steadies the nerves, and strengthens the muscles. Athletes, ancient and modern, have practiced it as a matter of course; it produced the models of Phidias and Praxiteles. Nor is it less beneficial for the mind. The total abstainer may never reach the giddy heights the alcohol-stimulated brain sometimes attains; but for clearness of conception, sureness of judgment, steadiness of re-

solve, the mind of the total abstainer enjoys special advantages. If it feels less stimulation, it also feels less reaction; if it feels less enthusiasm, it feels less depression. Sobriety and wisdom are the twin offspring of total abstinence; recklessness and insanity of alcohol.

And not only are mind and body benefited separately by total abstinence, but their mutual relations are thereby harmonized. It facilitates the dependence of body on mind, of matter on spirit, of passion on reason, which formed the foundation of man's original kingship. The total abstainer has more control over his passions; and these passions are in him less violent. The irritability caused by over-stimulated nerves, the moroseness caused by diseased liver, the exuberant good humor of one moment, the extreme dejection of another, are practically unknown to the total abstainer. He is master of his movements; from the strong citadel of a calm, unobfuscated mind he rules every part of his being with something of that supreme authority which the first man exercised before his fall. Even the strongest and most degrading of all passions, that of animal sensuality, is, generally speaking, restrained by total abstinence, as it is aroused and fomented by alcohol. Indeed total abstinence and purity are the great allies for building up, just as intemperance and impurity for pulling down, the temple of humanity. Few more suggestive sayings have been uttered by one of the greatest of thinkers than the words put into the mouth of his favorite character, old Adam, in "As You Like It":—

> "Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty:
> For in my youth I never did apply
> Hot and rebellious liquors in my blood;
> Nor did not with unabashful folly woo
> The means of weakness and debility."

"Hot and rebellious liquors in the blood" are the fomenters of lust, the fuel that gives fire, and the foul atmosphere that fans the flame of impurity—the unabashful wooers of "the means of weakness and debility."

Total abstinence, on the contrary, is a source of bodily strength, and a powerful restraint on disorderly passions.

And the total abstainer, who is thus master of himself, is all the better enabled to fulfil his duties, whether in the narrow circle of the family or in the broader circle of society. Who can think with any other feeling than one of horror of the families where alcoholism reigns—of the parents addicted to drink who bring children into the world infected with the poison of alcohol, and through it with the germs of loathsome disease; who bring up their children in an atmosphere of squalor and disorder, who

teach lessons of dissipation to the opening intelligence, and who thus lay the foundation of the physical and moral ruin of their little ones? Contrast this condition with that of the family where total abstinence reigns. The parents who are total abstainers have mutual love and peace among themselves. Their children are fresh and strong, without any taint of or any hereditary tendency to maddening drink. As they grow up, their opening minds are filled with respect for the parents who keep before them a high Christian ideal. And the parents labor cheerfully and successfully to provide for the family wants; they do not waste and squander their family's means in purchasing poison and poverty for themselves and palatial luxury for the liquor-dealers. It is in such families that the ideal relations of father and mother, son and daughter, most largely exist.

In much the same manner total abstinence contributes to make better citizens. The greatest need for good citizenship in this country is thoughtfulness and independence. The total abstainer is far more thoughtful than the heedless enthusiast or pessimist whose views are largely dependent on the quality and amount of alcoholic drink that he has consumed. He is also more independent. He cannot be bought by the social cup; and independence in this respect makes him independent in other matters, too. And thoughtful, independent citizens are the bulwark of the State. The theory that the liquor business adds to the wealth of the State is utterly fallacious. The revenue from its taxation is ultimately drawn from the consumer, that is, in most cases, from the sweat and blood, the poverty and degradation of the State's own citizens. The history of the liquor business in every community is twice cursed—cursing the producer and the consumers, the supply and the demand. "Ill-got, ill-gone," is written on every page of the history of the former; "ruin," physical and moral, on that of the latter. A State does not gain, in the end, by sucking the life's blood of its own children.

The true man which total abstinence does so much to produce—the man of right-ordered physique, of mental equilibrium, with the elements of his nature well-developed separately and harmonized in their operations—the naturally perfect man, is an excellent foundation for the supernatural Christian. Grace operates on and through nature; the more perfect the nature, the easier and more effective are the operations of Grace. Hence the facility with which the total abstainer lends himself to the influence of the supernatural. His whole being is in harmony with the great fundamental principle of Christianity—self-denial. Having denied himself even the moderate and perfectly licit use of alcoholic beverage, he finds it far easier to deny himself both the enjoy-

ments which fallen nature craves for but divine law forbids, as well as the numerous other things which "are lawful, but not expedient" for the perfect Christian. Mortification and development, pruning and grafting, is the great process of the spiritual as of the vegetative life. Total Abstinence is a strong factor in the work of hurrying the seed; Divine Grace does the fructifying.

Some may argue that what is here put forth in favor of total abstinence, considered in its effects, may also be asserted of the moderate and prudent use of strong drink. There is no denying that a strictly moderate drinker may be a model man and a model Christian. Many of the saints and many of the world's greatest men have been drinkers of wine. The use of drink, like that of food, should be regulated by the dictates of right reason. Now, the ordinary criterion by which right reason judges in such matters is that of health. The taking of any food or drink which is not injurious to health is, under ordinary circumstances, perfectly reasonable and licit.

But there may be circumstances that would render the taking of such drink, however innoxious in itself, altogether illicit, or, at least, undesirable. Such circumstances would be, for instance, the danger of giving disedification, the counteracting public opinion, or the exposing oneself to intemperance in a given time or country. This doctrine is clearly laid down by St. Augustine. In his work, "De Moribus Manichæorum," written at Rome, after his conversion, for the express purpose of refuting the Manichean superstitions, which held the use of flesh meat and wine bad in itself, and a breaking of what they considered one of the seals of justification, he lays down three reasonable motives for abstaining from wine—first, to restrain the delectation which wine causes, and which leads to intoxication; secondly, to protect the weaker brethren, who would not touch wine because they saw it offered in libations to false gods; thirdly, *and especially*, for charity's sake, not to weaken the resolution of those weaker ones for whom such total abstinence is necessary.[1]

This same doctrine is set forth by St. Thomas. After laying down the principle that the use of things considered necessary or useful for bodily health and condition is in accordance with the virtue of temperance, he condemns as sinful the use of such as are injurious; and, while admitting the licitness of the moderate use

[1] Apparet, igitur, ut opinor, quo fine a carnibus, et vino sit abstinendum. Is finis est triplex. Ad comprimendam delectationem, quæ in his maxime cibis haberi solet, atque in tali potu usque ad ebrietatem pervenire. Ad tuendam infirmitatem, propter illa quæ sacrificantur atque libantur. Est quod maxime commendandum est, propter caritatem, ne imbecilliorum ab his continentium offendatur infirmitas.—*De Mor. Manich.*, lib. ii., cap. xiv., n. 35.

of such things as are not injurious to health, he circumscribes even this moderate use by considerations of place, time, and agreement with the opinions and customs prevalent among those with whom we live.[1]

This doctrine of St. Augustine and St. Thomas is founded on the well-known teaching of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, and in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. "It is good not to eat flesh, and not to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother is offended, or scandalized, or made weak."[2] "Now, we that are stronger ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let everyone of you please his neighbor unto good, to edification; for Christ did not please himself."[3] "But meat doth not commend us to God. . . . . But take heed lest perhaps this your liberty become a stumbling-block to the weak. . . . . And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ hath died? Now when you sin thus against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ. Wherefore if meat scandalize my brother, I will never eat flesh, lest I should scandalize my brother."[4]

The meaning of this language is clear and thoroughly in accord with the dictates of right reason. What is indifferent in itself may cease to be so in certain circumstances; what may be perfectly prudent and temperate in a given place or time or company may cease to be so under altered surroundings. This is particularly true of the use of drink. The moderate and legitimate use of wine which prevails in certain European countries cannot be indulged in here without, as a rule, offending very many weaker brethren. Some it encourages to pursue the high road to excess; others it positively disedifies. There seems to be for the average American no middle course practicable between total abstinence and more or less intemperance. The reasons of this have been already given—the high nervous tension caused by this advanced material civilization, and the consequent tendency for strong alcoholic stimulants. America is not a wine-consuming country; whiskey and adulterated beer are the common beverage. To encourage by one's example the consumption of these ruin-producing products is clearly against charity in a country like this; to lessen it and to form a healthy public opinion against it is a duty on the

---

[1] Unde Philosophus dicit in 3 Ethic. quod temperatus appetit delectabilia propter sanitatem, vel propter bonam habitudinem. Alia vero quæ ad hoc non sunt necessaria, possunt dupliciter se habere. Quædam enim sunt impedimenta sanitatis, vel bonæ habitudinis; et his temperatus nullo modo utitur, hoc enim esset peccaterm contra temperantiam. Quædam vera sunt quæ non sunt his impedimenta; et his moderate utitur pro loco et tempore et congruentia eorum quibus convivit.—2a 2ae, Qcxli, A vi., ad 2.

[2] Rom. xiv., 21. [3] *Ibid.*, xv., 1, 2, 3. [4] I. Cor. viii., 8, 9, 11, 12, 13.

part of the strong and the influential. The sacrifice demanded by total abstinence is as nothing when compared with the rich harvest of blessings for oneself and for others which it secures. No total abstainer will ever regret having made his sacrifice for conscience sake, and for the sake of his weaker brethren; and not a day will pass but his heart will be gladdened by the great things which the Almighty will have accomplished through him. Those who read history closely, and who open their eyes to what is happening around them, know what a foul demon alcohol has been and is, and must feel that it is high time that he be unmasked, and dragged down from the throne whence he has reigned and ruled so long, whence he has spread such havoc and desolation, such crime and immorality, such misery and ruin, such death and destruction. Thoughtful men must know of the misfortunes and crimes that can be traced to alcohol's malignant influence. They know of the benighted parents whom it has made monsters of guilt towards one another and towards their little ones. They know of the children whom it has made homeless and fatherless and motherless. They know of the mouths which it has made hungry, of the limbs that it has made naked, of the brains that it has consigned to asylums. They know of the men whom it has made base and unmanly, of the women whom it has made shameless and unwomanly, of the children whom it has cast adrift into the vortex of perdition. They know of the homes that it has desecrated, the family ties it has severed, the family histories it has tarnished and disgraced. They know of the talents it has ruined, the prospects it has blighted, the lives it has wasted.

And knowing all this, true men will surely feel pressed by the charity of Christ to take a hand in dethroning alcohol by the most efficient, we may almost say, in the special circumstances of America, the only efficient weapon—Total Abstinence.

John T. Murphy, C.S. Sp.

RECENT PHASES OF BIBLE STUDY.

IT is not the intention of the present writer to give a list of the current literature on Bible study, nor to enumerate and characterize the more prominent workers in this field of investigation; he intends only to draw attention to some of the more important directions of work and thought developed during the course of the last few years. Completeness demands that no branch of even the introductory sciences be neglected in this review; in point of fact, it is probably in these preliminary branches that we shall find the most interesting and fundamental developments in both research and result. The true idea of inspiration, the Catholic rule of biblical exegesis, the present state of higher criticism, recent exploration and discovery, together with some of the more important commentaries, will, therefore, form the main topics of the following remarks.

"Inspiration Considered as a Trend"[1] is another practical proof that the inspiration of all the books of Holy Scripture, or of Holy Scripture simply and purely, cannot be demonstrated independently of the authority of the Church. The author defines "trend" as the "tendency that makes for an end and also for the potency that gains it." Now, "there are minds so constituted that an unmistakable trend is more convincing than the sight of the ultimate goal." For these the "trend in the various theories of inspiration proposed by devout students of the Bible, and that shown by the Bible itself," is the best proof for the divine inspiration of the Scriptures; for the direction of facts and theories justifies the assumption of inspiration, though the attainment of proof be impossible. Proceeding on these principles, the author first states his subject and discusses the questions involved; he next shows the common trend between the Bible and the institutions of the race, between the Bible and practical morals. Meanwhile, he touches the point that inspiration itself is the trend, "the same music, but grander," growing fuller and clearer through a long biblical history and the slow growth of many biblical conceptions. While Catholics admit that the light of revelation increased in brightness from the garden of Eden to the time of Jesus Christ and His apostles, they are careful to avoid such terms for the expression of this increase as might represent it in the form of a merely natural development; at the same time they are sure of

[1] By D. W. Faunce, D.D., Philadelphia, American Baptist Public. Soc.

the divine inspiration of the Bible not on the strength of a hypothesis that fitly explains a number of concentric facts, but on the authority of the infallible testimony of Christ's Church.

Mr. William T. Stead, of the "London Review of Reviews," is of opinion that "the discovery of the composite nature of many of the sacred books and their comparatively late origin has necessitated a change in the theory of inspiration."[1] How the writer infers a change of inspiration from either the composite character of the sacred books or their late origin is beyond our comprehension; for, even though much of the Old Testament be not an original work, but only a kind of review of reviews of the history and traditions of Israel—an assumption which we do not admit—it does not follow that either God in His inspiration or the inspired writer acts in the composition of the sacred books as Mr. Stead does when he monthly sieves and sifts "the voluminous mass of periodical literature, summarizing, condensing, and extracting, in order to get the main ideas of the writer into definite focus and manageable compass." And what is the change suggested by Mr. Stead? "On this subject it is absurd to dogmatize," continues the writer; the roughest outline of the new doctrine of inspiration must suffice, according to his opinion. Accordingly, we are informed that divine inspiration did not primarily flow into a book, but into the life of the Hebrew race. "There it germinated and grew until it bore fruit in certain pre-eminently-inspired personalities, such as Amos and Isaiah." It was the prophets and pious men that became the channels of the conception of the divine character and purpose which found its decisive culmination in the person of Jesus Christ. "The various books of the Old Testament mirror more or less accurately the various phases or stages of the evolution of the God-idea." The inspired writers were not infallible, but their errors never eclipsed the inspiring central idea of God and His kingdom, which always dominated the prophet, the editor, and the race. Such, we are told, "may be taken as the opinion of the more believing members of the school of higher critics." If we understand Mr. Stead aright, he regards the Old Testament prophets as mere enthusiasts such as we find, at times, in the temperance movement, while the other inspired writers are nothing but the editors of the works written under the influence of this moral enthusiasm.

Wilhelm Lotz[2] appears to agree with the foregoing opinion substantially; inspiration is nothing else but the aggregate of the divine actions by means of which God has disposed events in such a way as to make the Bible a book adapted to his end in the his-

[1] January, 1897.

[2] *Geschichte und Offenbarung im Alten Testament*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 211.

torical development of salvation. The "Imitation of Christ" and the "Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius," not to mention the works of the Fathers and the great theologians, are inspired in the strict sense of the word, if the word be taken in the sense of Lotz's definition.

The idea of inspiration described by W. Sanday[1] as the inductive theory of inspiration does not materially differ from the foregoing view, at least when it is taken in its completeness. Not to mention the different opinions concerning inspiration expressed in "A Clerical Symposium on Inspiration,"[2] we must draw attention to the last article of the collection in which Dr. Farrar summarizes and reviews all the preceding views. The Bible is a mere record of revelation; the expression "word of God" is not scriptural, but springs from the superstitious reverence for the Bible that has led men to the horrors of the Inquisition. When the apostles or evangelists write the history of Christianity, we perceive in their writing the voice of God making itself heard in the history of the world. In the same sense writes Canon Cheyne in the preface to his new book on the prophet Isaias[3], that the Bible is doubtless the vehicle of the spiritual messages addressed by Heaven to those souls that can attain spiritual truth. Again, that it is a record of the development of the spiritual life of Israel, and of the progressive expansion of Israel's thoughts over other more elevated nations. Other Protestant writers define inspiration rather by the effect produced by the reading of the sacred books than by their divine origin or their sacred contents; according to them, the Bible is inspired because it is inspiring.[4] Here, then, is another illustration of the pendulum-like movement of human thought. Originally Protestant writers regarded the Bible as the book of God in such a manner as to make mere machines of the inspired writers, while the Protestants of our day ascribe the Bible to the inspired writers in such a manner as to exclude the special and supernatural authorship of God. The words of protest against this destructive notion of inspiration addressed by the Protestant bishops, assembled in New York in October, 1894, to the ministers of their respective obediences, have remained without effect, and are, according to the opinion of Dr. Hodge, hardly worthy of mention.[5]

Among Catholics, too, a discussion has been raised concerning the true idea of inspiration. Fathers Pègues[6] and Lagrange[7] have

[1] *Inspiration*, Bampton Lectures, 1893, London, 1894, pp. 392 ff.
[2] London, 1884. [3] Introduction to the *Book of Isaiah*, London, 1895, p. x.
[4] *Cf. The Arena*, January, 1896, p. 188.
[5] *The Arena*, January, 1896, p. 188.
[6] *Revue Thomiste*, March, 1895; *Revue Biblique*, January, 1897.
[7] *Revue Biblique*, October, 1895, pp. 563 ff.; April, 1896, pp. 199 ff.; October, 1896, pp. 485 ff.

endeavored to lead our theologians and Bible students back to what they call the doctrine of St. Thomas on the nature of inspiration. They insist on the distinction between revelation and inspiration: the former implies that God supernaturally proposes or communicates certain truths to the created mind, while the latter supposes only that God supplies the mind with an infallible judgment concerning the truthfulness of certain thoughts already present in the mind. To illustrate what we mean, we may compare a teacher who makes his pupils memorize the propositions of Euclid with another who makes them understand what they have memorized under the direction of his predecessor, and both with a third who combines the good qualities of the other two teachers. The first of these teachers may be regarded as representing God in revelation, the second as symbolizing God in inspiration, the third as typifying God in the combined action of revelation and inspiration. Less is said by the foregoing writers about the divine action on the will of the inspired writer; on this point their theory does not seem to differ from what has been held commonly by recent theological writers on this subject. Where, then, is the practical application of all this? First, in the definition of inspiration; for while other authors view revelation as the complex of God's actions on the inspired writer's intellect and will, whether God actually communicates a given truth for the first time or only supplies the judgment concerning its truthfulness, Fathers Pègues and Lagrange find inspiration, strictly so called, only in the latter case, while they see in the former both inspiration and revelation. Secondly, they contend that with this idea of inspiration it is quite possible to admit and defend the theory of verbal inspiration, which alone they represent as conformable with Christian tradition and as consistent with Catholic dogma. Thirdly, Father Lagrange is of opinion that his view of inspiration is quite adapted to explain the difficulties raised against the inspiration of the Bible by the literary, scientific, rationalistic and historical criticism of our day. Fairness demands an additional word of explanation. Since inspiration as defined by the learned Dominican Fathers does not imply the supernatural communication of the truth or of the word expressive of the truth, but only the supernatural judgment concerning the truthfulness of the thought and concerning the propriety of a given word to express a certain thought, it is plain that the inspired writer may be left to his own industry to find out the material of his book as well as the language to be employed therein. This does not exclude a special providence directing the writer in his labor and facilitating the same. After the matter and the verbal expression of the book have been thus worked out by the writer, God steps in and infuses into the writer's mind an in-

fallible judgment concerning the truthfulness of the thought, concerning its practical adaptability for the book, and concerning the propriety of its verbal expression chosen by the author. In this way God inspires not only every thought of the book, but also every word; at the same time both thought and word are the outcome of the inspired writer's mind and work, so that we must expect to find in them the picture of the author's style and intellectual endowment. Passages quoted from other writers can thus be appropriated by the inspired writer, and the artistic forms of profane literature can thus be employed in the sacred books of the inspired prophet and historian, so that no argument against the inspired character of a book can be based on its use of previous documents, or on its presenting recognized figures of rhetoric, or even on its appearance in the garb of poetry, parable or fiction.

All this is true and clear, but does not differ from what has been said on the same questions by other writers, except in the use of terms. Cardinal Franzelin, *e.g.*, knows the difference between God's communicating the thought itself to the inspired writer and illuminating the writer's mind concerning a known truth, just as the foregoing writers distinguish between the revelation of a truth and the infused judgment concerning its truthfulness;[1] again, Cardinal Franzelin denies that, in general, the words themselves are communicated by God to the sacred writer, though God's assistance in the choice and use of the words is emphasized by him[2] just as the foregoing writers deny that God reveals the words to the inspired writer, but maintain that he infuses into them the infallible judgment concerning the propriety of the language to be used in the sacred book; furthermore, Cardinal Franzelin agrees with the foregoing writers in maintaining that the language of the inspired author presents all the peculiarities of profane literature.[3] Where, then, do the learned Dominican writers differ from Cardinal Franzelin? It is in the use of the term "inspiration" that the difference makes itself felt; the Cardinal does not call "inspiration" the action of God that influences the choice and use of words on the part of the sacred writer, while the two Dominican Fathers express this divine action, suppositis supponendis, by the name "inspiration." In consequence, the Cardinal denies that the words of the inspired books are simply inspired, while the Dominican Fathers maintain "verbal inspiration." It sounds, therefore, somewhat comical when the "Revue Biblique" writes of Fr. Lagrange's system as the traditional one, and adds: "L'apologie n'en souffrira pas, elle est plus à l'aise dans les vastes édifices de la théologie tra-

[1] *Cf. De Divina Tradit. et Script.*, Romæ, 1882, pp. 347 ff.
[2] *Cf. Franzelin, De Divina Trad. et Script.*, Romæ, 1882, pp. 350 ff.
[3] *Cf. Franzelin*, l. c., pp. 352 f.

ditionelle que dans les constructions modernes dressées à la hâte, comme un abri provisoire, par le Cardinal Franzelin."[1] Again, when one reads,[2] "On voit que nous nous écartons dès le point de depart de la methode du Cardinal Franzelin," and sees how near Fr. Lagrange comes to the Cardinal's conclusions in the end, one is reminded of the old saw, "Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus."

Profs. Kaulen and Schöpfer[3] have had quite a tilt about the relation between the results of profane science and the principles of exegesis. The discussion naturally stirred up other writers to express their views on the subject. Among these must be noticed Fr. v. Hummelauer,[4] Prof. Schanz,[5] Canon Selbst[6] and Fr. Nisius.[7] It is to be regretted that the point at issue has from the start been too much obscured by the feeling of the principal combatants. In point of fact, the difference of opinion between the two learned professors is not as great as their writings make it appear to be, on account of their lack of a more objective attitude. The question at issue is whether a commentator may differ from the obvious meaning of a passage in Scripture and from its traditional explanation, on account of the results of scientific discoveries. Dr. Schöpfer maintains the affirmative in both parts of the question; moreover, he maintains that even probable results in the field of scientific investigation ought to have their proper weight in true biblical exegesis, a weight proportionate to the amount of probability of the scientific result. The author appeals to the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus," to St. Augustin, Albertus Magnus, St. Bonaventure, and finally to the Tridentine and the Vatican decrees, together with their commentators, for the proof of his contention. Prof. Kaulen believes the foregoing opinion makes the results of profane science the corrective of the Bible, finding errors in the Bible on the testimony of natural sciences; again, he is of opinion that Dr. Schöpfer endeavors to explain the sacred text according to the dictates of profane science without first determining its meaning according to the recognized principles of hermeneutics. On his own part, Prof. Kaulen seems in one passage to deny that the Scripture commentator should in any way be guided by the results of science, and to place on science the burden of harmonizing its results with the exegesis of the Bible;[8] in another passage the professor is of opinion that the commen-

[1] *Revue Biblique*, 1895, p. 571. [2] *Revue Biblique*, 1896, p. 206.

[3] *Cf. Literarischer Handweiser*, 1895, nn. 4, 5; *Bibel und Wissenschaft, Grundsätze und deren Anwendung auf die Probleme der biblischen Urgeschichte*, by Dr. Aem. Schöpfer, Brixen, 1896.

[4] *Zeitschrift f. k. Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1897, pp. 152 ff.

[5] *Biblische Studien, zweites Heft.* [6] *Katholik*, 1895, pp. 552 ff.

[7] *Zeitschrift f. k. Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1897, pp. 155 ff. [8] P. 123.

tator's knowledge of sciences should only serve to refute the scientific objections against the divine character of the Bible.

If we examine the position of the two combatants, we find that Kaulen acts against his own tenets, for he endeavors to strengthen his view on the confusion of languages by an appeal to acknowledged scientifie authorities.[1] Besides, he grants that an explanation of Scripture which contradicts an established fact of physical science is certainly false. On the other hand, the proofs advanced by Schöpfer for his thesis are not convincing. The Encyclical advises the use of external erudition in the explanation of Scriptures—"externa quoque appositæ eruditionis illustratio societur"—and does not at all enumerate the results of profane science among the criteria of Bible interpretation. St. Augustin in his "Confessions" and "Gen. ad lit.," and St. Thomas in his "Commentary on the Sentences," do not touch upon the rules of Scriptural hermeneutics, but only endeavor to give a dogmatico-philosophical explanation of the truths of faith. Finally, when the Vatican Council, repeating and explaining the Tridentine injunction concerning the interpretation of Sacred Scripture, says, "Ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, is pro vero sensu Sacræ Scripturæ habendus sit, quem tenuit ac tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia," it does not thereby declare that in other matters the Catholic commentator is independent of the authority of the Church in his explanation of Sacred Scripture, and may, therefore, follow the results, certain or otherwise, of profane science without regard to the tenets of Catholic tradition and the teaching of the Fathers. Granderath in his commentary on the Vatican decrees is quite pronounced on this point: "Animadvertendum est, hæc concilia ita statuere, Scripturæ interpretem in rebus religiosis ita ecclesiæ interpretationem sequi debere, ut non dicant eum in rebus quæ religiosæ non sint, liberum esse. Hoc alterum neque illis Conciliorum decretis formaliter continetur neque ex iis immediate effici potest." If we, therefore, strip the contentions of both Schöpfer and Kaulen of their respective excesses, we come to the conclusion that both agree, at least, in this, that the results of science, whether certain or only probable, are an external and negative criterion in the interpretation of Holy Scripture; they show, in other words, what in certain texts cannot be the true meaning of Scripture without furnishing a positive key to its genuine sense.

Professor Zöckler, of Greifswald,[2] gives a bird's-eye view of the present state of Old Testament criticism. According to him the struggle is raging more hotly now than ever before. In both the

---

[1] P. 122.

[2] *Beweis des Glaubens*, n 12.

antagonistic camps, the liberal and the conservative, scholars are now drawing the practical conclusions of modern criticism in so far as they affect the Church and the teaching of faith. Even outsiders, belonging to circles not directly engaged in the controversy, begin to understand and appreciate the vital issue at stake, whether we are to adhere to the new Marcionism which practically removes the books of the Old Testament from the canon of the inspired writings, and thus destroys the historic basis of revealed religion; for what began with the Pentateuchal question within the limits of scholastic circles has now become a contest covering the entire Old Testament, and penetrated into our periodical literature and our polychrome bibles, wherein the effect of the work of the higher critics upon the traditional theories of inspiration is made plain to plain men. Nearly the entire Old Testament literature, and in particular the Psalms, we are told, really originated in post-exilic times, the oldest book of the whole collection being "Osee." The law is not the beginning of the literary and religious development in Israel, but almost its end; for it was only after the prophets had developed monotheism in Israel that the priests endeavored to regulate the worship of the people mainly by the legal code, and that the sapiential and ascetic writers began to influence the interior life of the nation by their respective productions. The traditional conception of Israel's history is thus literally turned upside down, as far as the origin of the sacred books is concerned. According to the higher critics, the legal canon may be regarded as complete about the time of Esdras and Nehemias,[1] when the Pentateuch was promulgated, while the prophetic writings were collected into their canon about 250 B.C., and the canon of the hagiographa may probably be placed about 100 B.C. It is only in this way that, according to the contention of the critics, the religion of the Old Testament and its growth can be intelligently explained as a phenomenon of history.

On the other hand, the conservative defenders of the traditional view maintain that the foregoing theory is nothing but naturalism, "a religion of the era of Darwin." Excellent use has been made, also, of the position of Christ and the Apostles with reference to the Old Testament, its canonical authority, and its historical character and inspiration. The evident disagreement between the position of Christ and that of the modern critics in reference to the Old Testament and the Scriptures in general has worried and perplexed these critics not a little, and has led to many devices aiming to overthrow this argument, which, however, only succeed in the degree in which the divine character of Christ is ignored or denied.

---

[1] B.C. 444.

While the higher critics are represented by such men as Wellhausen, Kuenen, Cheyne, Driver, Wildeboer, Reuss, Robertson, Smith, the conservative side is defended by Green, Bissel, Rohnert, Kölling, Rupprecht, Adolf Zahn. Professor Sayce endeavors to carry the battle into the very ranks of the liberals by urging the results of recent archæological studies against them, and Fritz Hommel[1] irritates them by pointing out the antiquity of the personal names in the so-called Priestly Code. Much has been said and written in the liberal camp against Professor Sayce's premises and Professor Hommel's conclusion. If the higher critics were as careful about their own statement of facts and the logical conclusiveness of their own inferences as they expect their opponents to be, their theories about the composite character of the Old Testament books and the late origin of the same would soon vanish into thin air. This may be said in general without investigating in each particular point of controversy how far each of the contesting parties is right or wrong.

The popular attitude to the views of higher criticism among the conservative Protestants and Jews of our day may be learned by calling to mind two incidents of this year. In his series of sermons "On the Bible as Literature," delivered in the Plymouth pulpit, Brooklyn, Dr. Lyman Abbott treated on January 24th of the Book of Jonas, representing it as "a satire, conceived in the spirit of Oriental imagination, and depending for its value on the lesson of which it is a vehicle." The words of Christ referring to the history of Jonas,[2] the Reverend Speaker considers as a mere addition to Christ's words made either by St. Matthew or some early copyist. On the Wednesday following the sermon, the Manhattan Association of Congregational Ministers—the Plymouth pulpit belongs to the Congregational Communion—after some animated discussion, passed the following resolution by a vote of 20 to 6: "In view of certain recent and current public utterances from a prominent Congregational pulpit in this city concerning the Bible, which are being widely disseminated by the press, we, the members of the Manhattan Association of Congregational Ministers, fearing lest our silence be accepted by the uninformed as an indorsement of these views, do declare our emphatic dissent from such handling of Holy Scriptures, and deplore the probable effect of such teachings." Rev. Sam. Eliot, of the First Unitarian Church of Brooklyn, personally agrees with Dr. Abbott in his views on the Book of Jonas, but thinks "that straightforward methods demand that men of the liberal orthodoxy no longer remain within the orthodox church." The

[1] *Cf. Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, May, 1897, published simultaneously in English and German.

[2] Matth., xii., 40.

"Christian Advocate"[1] has in its issue of January 20th an editorial on the "Personal Equation," and is of opinion that when Dr. Abbott writes or speaks "on religious doctrine, there is a delightful vagueness, reminding one of a panorama of castles and mountains on elevated heights, across which iridescent clouds are being driven by the summer breeze." The Reverened Gentleman "advances, retreats, modifies, advances again, here emphasizing and there ignoring passages of Scripture, until the result is a system of tentative theories which for the want of a suitable expression we will venture to call Lyman-Abbottized Christianity." "The Independent"[2] summarizes the Protestant criticisms on the sermon of Dr. Abbott, reducing it to three heads: "First, that he treats irreverently the cherished beliefs of many Christians as to the Bible. . . . . Second, that he teaches from the pulpit as the final conclusions of scholars, theories of the Bible which are yet in the critical crucibles. . . . . Third, that his doctrine of religious evolution contradicts and denies supernaturalism." Of this last charge, however, the "Independent" thinks it must acquit Dr. Abbott.

After this general sketch of the common Protestant attitude as to the tenets of the higher critics we may consider their reception by the body of the Jewish community. Mr. Claude Montefiore maintains in the "Jewish Quarterly Review" that four questions must be settled before the Jews can move forward in the direction of reform: First, What is to be their exact position toward the Pentateuch? Secondly, What is to be their exact position toward the miracles of the Old Testament? Thirdly, What is to be their relation to the personality and the teachings of Jesus? Fourthly, What is to be their attitude toward the New Testament as a whole? According to Dr. Hirsch, American Reform Judaism has already settled the first two of the foregoing questions, having declared the Pentateuch "to be no longer the embodiment of our religious ideals, nor the authoritative compulsory regulator of our religious life and its binding practices." Again, "the miracles of the Old Testament we read in the light of folklore, myth and legend. In one word, we accept the method and results of Biblical criticism without reserve." The "Hebrew Journal" remarks on the preceding position of Dr. Hirsch as follows: "Here at once we must register our protest, not in the name of 'the rabble that is chafing and foaming' at your curious position, if you please, but in the name of those hundred thousands of Jews whose numbers comprise men of vast learning and deep thought, not inferior to any of the shining lights of your Reform Judaism. We are

[1] New York, Methodist Episcopal. [2] Undenominational.

not prepared at all to say that the Pentateuch does not embody our religious ideal; on the contrary, we affirm (and no one knows better than Dr. Hirsch that 90 per cent. at least of the community of Israel in the United States are with us) that it embodies and reflects the ideal of Judaism for our times and for all times to come as it did until now. This is not a mere assertion on the part of the writer, but a verity, of which Dr. Hirsch can easily convince himself if he tries to take up the subjects involved by the teachings of the Law of Moses against any of the learned conservative representatives of Judaism, not necessarily 'rabbis' or officiating ministers."

In a series of articles on the "History of the Old Testament Canon," that appeared in the "Christliche Welt" at Leipzig, Ernst Teichmann gives the following sketch of the present status of the New Testament criticism: "The first letter of Paul to the Thessalonians, the oldest book in the New Testament, was written about the year 54 or 55. The so-called second epistle of St. Peter is the latest book in the canon, and cannot have originated earlier than the second half of the second century. The nearer this letter is placed to 200 A.D. the better it can be understood historically. Under the most favorable circumstances, then, there is at least a difference of one hundred years between the earliest and the latest New Testament book, and possibly it may be one hundred and fifty years. . . . . The formation of these various books into a canon transpired in three periods, the first reaching down to 140 A.D., in which practically no collection of sacred books as a collection existed in the Christian churches; a second period, down to 200 A.D., in which the fundamental form of the canon obtained recognition, though in various shapes, in the churches; the third period, from 200 down, in which the canon assumed the form now accepted. Not one of the original disciples of Christ has left us a single line in writing, just as little as Christ did himself. The New Testament books bearing the names of these disciples in the New Testament canon cannot stand the scrutiny of historical criticism, and belong to the very latest productions of the canon. . . . . A difference in this policy was effected by the apostle Paul, the most conspicuous of the early representatives of the Christian cause. Paul had not been under the spell of the personal influence of Jesus, and yet he learned to understand the Lord most thoroughly, and it was he who first drafted literature and letters into the service of the church. Yet it never entered his mind that through his letters he was calling into existence a new class of holy writings. . . . . He never appeals to other letters of his, nor presupposes that these are generally known. The only exception to this method of procedure in the New Testament books is the

Apocalypse of John, already cited. . . . . In regard to the authenticity of the New Testament books there has been considerable advance since the days of Baur. The literary origin of the first three gospels constitutes a problem by itself, namely, the synoptic question; it being the general opinion that the original Mark gospel and a compilation of our Lord's sayings and doings, mentioned by Papias, and originally written in Hebrew, constitute the basis of our gospel; while the fourth gospel stands absolutely alone, its authenticity being yet questioned by some critics. The golden circle consisting of Romans, two Corinthians and Galatians, stands absolutely above any doubt or debate. Of the other Pauline epistles the pastoral are questioned more than any others, but the tendency is decidedly conservative. Paul's authorship of Hebrews is being defended more now than has been the case for many decades. The Catholic Epistles are the great debatable ground for critical research."

In the "Christian Work,"[1] Dr. Behrends announces triumphantly that the call for the retreat of the higher critics has sounded. The reason for this hopeful view of the doctor lies in the recent publication of Dr. Harnack's first volume of "Chronology of Old Christian Literature." "This book has stirred me up to the depths. It seems to me that it marks the beginning of the end," is the testimony of the writer. Tradition is said to be vindicated as true and trustworthy, while the interest in literary criticism is waning and historical studies are replacing it. Hence the problems of the future lie in the domain of history, not of literary criticism, simply because tradition is right in its estimate of the literature. Now, the assumptions of the Wellhausen school, in the treatment of the Old Testament, are identical with the assumptions of Baur, which Harnack emphatically discredits and repudiates. If, then, the New Testament critics are compelled, on historical grounds, to believe in the supernatural origin of Christianity, the Old Testament critics will have to follow. All this appears to be most promising; external evidence has been replaced in its proper position of paramount authority, while internal evidence seems to be appealed to only as of secondary value. Still Harnack himself is not so pronounced on this point as he is represented to be: "Die inneren Kriterien für die Zeit und Herkunft der Schriften habe ich selten und mit grosser Behutsamkeit angewendet, um den circulus vitiosus zu vermeiden nach einer vorausgesetzten inneren Entwicklung der Tradition und Literatur das Alter der einzelnen Stücke und nach diesen wiederum die innere Entwicklung festzustellen."[2] Not to speak, therefore, of the late

[1] April 17. [2] P. v.

date assigned by Harnack to some of the New Testament books (II. Pet., *e.g.*, and the Pastoral Epistles), the author agrees even in his method, at least partially, with the principles of the higher critics, admitting, as he does, the existence of historical evolution.

It may be of interest to note that among certain biblical critics the cry "back to Christ" has been made a sort of watchword. They endeavor, by a close examination of the "simple original gospels," to reconstruct the historical Christ, and to clear away the obscurity and error which nineteen centuries of strife and turmoil have placed between the present generation and its Redeemer. While we maintain that such a return to Christ is the sole hope of salvation for the world as well as the individual, the method in which it is effected may prove the ruin of both Church and Christianity. The influence of a real picture of Christ may be learned, in a measure, from the effect produced by Tissot's paintings of the life of our Saviour even on the minds of the worldly Parisian sightseers. But going back to Christ after the manner of the higher critics leads to quite different results, as is shown by Albert Réville's "Jésus de Nazareth." We may illustrate what has been said by the following propositions from the conclusion of the last chapter of the book: "The legend of the miraculous birth is a homage paid to a holiness which appeared extraordinary. . . . . The dogma of the divinity of Jesus Christ is the mythical way of expressing the penetration of human nature by the Spirit of God. . . . . The dogma of redemption by the suffering and death of Christ is the mythical representation of the fact, which is proved by experience and illustrated by the greatest martyrs, that the progress and freedom of humanity are attained at the cost of suffering undergone by those who are its benefactors. . . . . The dogma of original sin sums up in the persons of the first ancestors of our race, persons who are more mythical than real, what happens over and over again each time that a man is born into the world." Dr. Caird, Master of Balliol, Oxford,[1] believes that the tendency of going back to Christ has done much good, but, at the same time, is afraid that it is based on an illusion. "For two things," the doctor writes, "are obvious. In the first place, that after all our effort we can only make a far-off approximation to the impression of actual contact. . . . . And in the second place, if we could translate ourselves into the past, we should not get from it what we wish, except as interpreted by all those experiences, all those controversies and conflicts of the subsequent time, from which we seek to escape—controversies and

[1] *Cf. The New World*, March.

conflicts of thought and life which could not be present to the mind of Jesus or to his disciples, but which have been evolved in the effort to work out the ideas which they expressed." The writer believes that if we follow this method of regress to the end we shall reduce our conception of Christ to something very vague and general; something to which the religion of the world cannot possibly be attached. On the other hand, if this method be rejected, we cannot, according to the doctor's opinion, draw lines of division anywhere, but must treat Christ as, in a sense, an idea or a spirit, which is continually finding new organs, developing new powers, and assimilating new elements of human life. Finally, the futility of the enterprise of going back to Christ, flowing from its inherent impossibility and carrying us to an unnatural abstraction of the person of Jesus, must not discourage or grieve us overmuch; for Christ himself assures us, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you." In spite of his sincerity and good will, Dr. Caird robs Christianity of the person of Christ and substitutes an abstract principle in his place; he does not appear to have realized that Christianity without the concrete Christ is equivalent to religion without a personal God, and necessarily carries in it the germ of its own destruction.

"Recent Research in Bible Lands, Its Progress and Results," edited by Herman V. Hilprecht,[1] contains a series of articles prepared for the "Sunday School Times" by a number of American and European specialists. First, Prof. J. F. McCurdy sums up the results obtained from Egyptian, Arabic, Palestinian, Babylonian and Assyrian excavations and literature; then follows a paper by F. J. Bliss, on "The Mounds of Palestine"; next, Prof. Herman V. Hilprecht treats of the "Explorations in Babylonia"; this is followed by Prof. Sayce's "Research in Egypt"; then Prof. Hommel tells in a pleasing way about the "Discoveries and Researches in Arabia"; next, William Hayes Ward gives a fair statement of what we know and do not know about "The Hittites"; "Early Greek Manuscripts from Egypt" are considered in the paper prepared by Prof. J. P. Mahaffy, while Prof. W. M. Ramsay summarizes our "New Light on the Book of Acts." It is plain that a summary of all these articles is beyond the limits of the present paper—at best, we can but emphasize one or another of the more important results.

The most remarkable achievement of exploration in Egypt has been the discovery of a great mass of Græco-Roman papyri at Behnesa, eighty miles south of Cairo, by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. Nearly the whole site of Behnesa (ancient Oxyrrynchus)

[1] Philadelphia, 1896.

was underlaid more or less plentifully with these papyri. They had been carried in baskets from the city office of the Roman administration, and had been laid in large heaps and fired without being removed from the baskets. Too bulky to burn well, and gradually covered over by natural accumulations, they remained undisturbed till last winter. Heaps of this sort were found in no less than three places, and on one day thirty-six of these baskets, on another twenty-five, were taken out, and, owing to the sturdiness of the baskets, were taken in them to the camp of the excavators.

Besides the rejected papyri, the site furnished a great many fragments, among them one to two hundred Iliad MSS. and a leaf written on each side in Greek uncials, and containing a number of the sayings of Jesus.[1] One page can be read without much difficulty, while the other is less intelligible; the leaf is from a book, not from a roll, 15 by 9 cm. in size, and was mixed with other fragments dating back to the period between the first and third centuries A. D. To judge from its written characters, it may be placed shortly after 200 A. D. Only six of our Lord's sayings are preserved in a complete state: (1) ". . . and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye. (2) Jesus says: Except you fast to the world, you shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except you keep the Sabbath, you shall not see the Father. (3) Jesus says: I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen by them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I thirsting among them, and my soul grieves over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart. . . . (4) Jesus says: Wherever they are . . . and there is one . . . alone, I am with him; raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there I am. (5) Jesus says: A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither does a physician work cures upon his acquaintances. 6. Jesus says: A city built upon the top of a high hill, and established, can neither fall nor be hid."

Between numbers 3 and 4 a line appears to be missing, of which we can read only ". . . and . . . poverty. . . ." After Number 6 the words ". . . thou hearest . . . unto thy face [or presence] . . ." are the only remnant of a saying of Jesus that seems to allude to Mark xii., 29. It is quite impossible to determine, with our present data, either the character or the origin of the Sayings of Jesus with any sort of certainty or probability. The form of the papyrus shows that it is a collection of sayings taken from their context, and gathered together with an end in view

[1] *Cf.* Λόγια Ἰησοῦ, *Sayings of Our Lord, from an Early Greek Papyrus*, discovered and edited, with translation and commentary, by Bernard P. Grenfell, M.A., and Arthur S. Hunt, M.A. Published by Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, London.

that is still unknown. As to the contents, the papyrus may have belonged to an orthodox communion as well as to a heretical one. There is no need of admitting a Judaizing tendency in the second saying, since it speaks of the spiritual keeping of the Sabbath; nor need we explain the fourth saying pantheistically, after the manner of some gnostic gospels. Harnack is of opinion that the fragment belongs to the Gospel of the Egyptians in use among the Encratites and the Sabellians; but we possess only one sentence concerning the last judgment of this gospel, so that its character is quite unknown to us. But in spite of all this, it is quite certain that at present the higher critics and rationalists cannot gain any advantage from the "Sayings of Jesus"; for they cannot be part of the much-sought-after commentary of Papias on the "Sayings of the Lord," nor can they be identified with any of the documents from which our synoptic gospels are said to be derived. Harnack is quite emphatic, in his thesis, that the beginning of the third saying corresponds with the faith in Christ's divinity as manifested by Paul, John, and the author of 1 Tim., iii., 16. Moreover, we are told the manifestation of this faith in the "Sayings of Jesus" surpasses that contained in the gospels, because in the "Sayings" it is placed in the mouth of Christ Himself—a manner of expression which even the fourth gospel does not dare to employ, if we may believe the contention of Harnack. At any rate, if the "Sayings of Jesus," as read on the Egyptian papyrus, are identified with the "Urevangelium," the belief in Christ's divinity cannot be a later dogmatic evolution.

Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie wrote on February 14, 1896, to Mr. Breasted: " . . . . The Ramesseum is of Ramses II. . . . . The chapel of Uazmes was rebuilt by Amenhotep III. . . . . The temple next south is of Tahutmes IV. . . . . Next is a big tomb of Khonsu ardus, goldsmith of the temple of Amen, XXV. dynasty. . . . . Then comes a leveled plain . . . . and on the plain . . . . was a temple of Queen Tausert. . . . . Then south of that is the so-called temple of Amenhotep III., which is really the funereal temple of Merenptah. That beast smashed up all the statues and sculptures of Amenhotep II. to put into his foundations, and wrecked the gorgeous temple behind the colossi for building-material. . . . ." Among the building-material thus appropriated was a splendid stela of black syenite, ten feet three inches high, five feet four inches wide, and thirteen inches thick. It had been inscribed with an account of Amenhotep III.'s religious activities but had been defaced by his son Amenhotep IV., the heretic king, in order to erase the name and mention of Amon; then it had been restored by Seti I., when it was seized by Merenptah for his temple. He placed it face to the wall, and engraved upon its

exposed back a hymn of praise to himself. It is on this slab that, according to most interpreters, the name "Israel" occurs for the first time in any Egyptian inscription. The line is rendered "Ysiraal is spoiled, it hath no seed" (Mr. Griffith, Petrie, Cheyne, Col. Conder), or "Israel is a barren land without fear" (Dr. Spiegelberg), or "Israel has been torn out without offshoot" (Prof. W. Max Müller); Sir P. le Page Renouf maintains that "Jezreel" must be read instead of "Israel," while Dr. Steindorff translates "Israelites," not "Israel."

Supposing, then, that there is enough of evidence to render the mention of "Israel" in the inscription of Merenptah at least probable, we are met by an interesting problem: For many plausible reasons Ramses II., the father of Merenptah, has been generally identified with the Pharaoh of the oppression, while Merenptah himself has been commonly believed to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Without examining the solidity of the reasons, we may draw attention to the fact that the new inscription appears to deal the death-blow to this general belief, since the "spoiling of Israel," to which it refers, appears to have taken place in Palestine, not in Egypt, so that the people of Israel must have been settled in Palestine before the time of Merenptah. It is true that Dr. Sellin, together with writers in the "Expository Times" for July, 1896, refer the words "is spoiled, hath no seed," retrospectively to the repressive measures of Pharaoh recorded in Ex. i. Prof. Flinders Petrie in his article[1] suggests that part of the children of Israel may have never left Palestine, or they may have returned thither before the body of the people left Egypt. But these explanations are not probable in themselves, nor have they found much favor among recent writers. Prof. James Orr[2] endeavors, therefore, to solve the riddle by making Thothmes III. the Pharaoh of the oppression, Amenhotep II. the Pharaoh of the Exodus, so as to place the latter event in the eighteenth dynasty instead of the nineteenth. On this hypothesis we obtain the following rough outline of chronology: Abraham lived about the time of Chedorlaomer, or about 2100 B.C.; Israel went into the land of Egypt about 1900; end of the Egyptian bondage about 1470; allowing, then, enough of time for the desert-wandering, the conquest of Palestine under Josue, the period of the Judges, the reign of Saul and David, we may fix the founding of the temple at about 969 B.C., a date which harmonizes with the Assyrian chronology. Space does not allow us to develop here the various considerations that may be urged in favor of this chronology; it is sufficient that it agrees well with the biblical data.

We need not here insist on the importance of the Hebrew text

[1] *Contemporary Review*, May, 1896. [2] *Expositor*, March, 1897.

of the Ecclesasticus, which St. Jerome had seen, and which a number of Rabbinic writers, from Simeon ben Shetach to Gaon R. Saadyah,[1] have quoted. But after the eleventh century the Hebrew text of the book disappeared, and seemed to be lost for ever. It was, therefore, a delightful surprise when among the various Hebrew MSS. brought from Palestine by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, there was discovered a fragment corresponding with Ecclus. xxxix. 15–xl. 7. The Hebrew text contained on the fragment, together with its English translation, was published by Mr. Schechter in the "Expositor" for January, 1896. Meanwhile, a number of Hebrew fragments had come into the Bodleian Library through the kindness of Prof. Sayce, and it was among these that the continuation of the same Hebrew MS. was discovered, beginning at the very verse at which the other fragment breaks off, and containing, therefore, Ecclus. xl. 8–xlix. ii. The whole text, including the former fragment, comprises about 350 verses, and has been neatly printed, with an English translation on the opposite page, and underneath the Syriac and Greek versions.[2] The Hebraist, the student of literature, the biblical commentator, and the historical theologian find in the text ample material for reflection.

On glancing over the current literature in the field of Scripture study one notices that the greater part is concerned with the introductory branches or the subsidiary sciences. Hermeneutics and criticism, inspiration, geography, archæology, history are well represented, while exegesis occupies a smaller part, and the continuous commentary on whole books is comparatively rare—*i.e.*, in comparison with the bulk of Biblical literature. And still the knowledge of Sacred Scripture does not consist in grammatical and historical erudition, in the current critical theories on the origin and composition of certain books of the Old or the New Testament, but in a comprehensive understanding of each book, of its general tendency, as well as of the real meaning of every single chapter and verse. At the same time it must be remembered that in order to understand Sacred Scripture one needs not to be acquainted with the whole history of human errors. The commentator must know what God says in the inspired text, but is not obliged to know or remember all that has been said or imagined by man about its meaning. Of course, if there be question of a text the meaning of which is not certain, one must inquire into its various probable explanations, but to delay over the exposition of expla-

[1] 70 B.C. to 949 A.D.; perhaps to Gaon R. Hai, who died in 1038 A.D.

[2] The original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix. 15-xlix. 11), together with the early versions and an English translation, followed by the quotations from *Ben Sira* in rabbinical literature, edited by A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A., with two fac-similes. Oxford, Clarendon Press. Small quarto. Price, 10s. 6d.

nations that are evidently wrong is a mere loss of time. Our future commentator, therefore, must be clear, concise, and, above all, judicious in the selection of his material. With the accumulated material of centuries at his command he naturally finds it more difficult to omit well than to write well. What is old and precious must not be crowded out by what is new and fanciful; but, on the other hand, our recent jewels must find a place, in preference to the rubbish of antiquity. "Every scribe in the kingdom of heaven is like to a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old."[1]

A. J. Maas, S.J.

FROM MACHIAVELLI TO JOHN CALVIN, THROUGH JOHN MORLEY.[2]

MR. JOHN MORLEY'S present mental poise appears to be somewhat akin to that of Mahomet's coffin. In his latest work, the Romanes Lecture of 1897, whose subject is "Machiavelli," we find traces of an uncertainty of reasoning and an inconsequence of conclusion that are not in keeping with his reputation.

It is on the maxims of government contained in his book called "The Prince" that the fame or the infamy of Machiavelli rests. Whatever Mr. John Morley or any other authority may say to the contrary, experience has proved that the civil state everywhere, when driven to act on the defensive, has invariably acted on the principles laid down by Machiavelli as essential to the rule of a prince. It may be virtuous if possible; it must be wicked if necessary, according to its own view of necessity; it may be loved if it can; it must be feared if it would subsist. These are, in effect, the cardinal principles of civil power. Morality and religion are things apart; useful adjuncts in felicitous times, but cumbersome and crippling trammels when serious work has to be done. If Mr. Morley would be kind enough to point out to us any instance wherein modern governments, *qua* governments, have acted on

[1] Matt. xiv., 52.

[2] *Machiavelli.* By John Morley. New York and London: The MacMillan Company.

any other principle, we would confess our obligation. Individual ministers have been conscientious; individual ministries may have been; the monarch occasionally may have had some misgivings about certain courses in politics. But where is the state which has been swayed purely by moral considerations in its dealings with neighbor states? The sense of justice being on its side in any particular quarrel does not constitute the high attribute of which he speaks. Justice, in the concrete, may be on both sides in a controversy which may lead to war; in the abstract it can only pertain to one; that is to say, both sides may honestly believe that justice is on their side, and they have no desire but to maintain their view in entering on the struggle. But, in order to fulfil the conditions of Machiavelli's disregard of ethics, we must take the higher estimate of that great quality which, in times of stress, ought to be set aside by the ruler. Here we find the Italian sage-cynic landed in a paradox. He finds ethics and morality, unknown to himself, after he has destroyed them. The safety of the prince, otherwise the state, is the highest law; and in condemning this maxim of Machiavelli's as immoral, Mr. Morley tacitly condemns every European civil government and almost every European monarch since the days of Saint Louis.

Mr. Morley is himself to blame if he leaves us in doubt regarding what he considers morality or the reverse in statecraft in this consideration. Morality in politics, he assumes (possibly because he himself is swayed by undefined conscientious principles in his political action), is one of the living forces by which governments and society exist. The British Empire, as he himself might be coerced to admit, is a living example to the contrary; nor can it be said that any other of the present great monarchial divisions of the Old World rests its claims for sovereignty upon any higher ethical standard. This is the view which any impartial outsider must be impelled to take when considering the means by which their geographical delimitations have been brought about or their dynastic succession assured—the seizure of Silesia, for instance, by the Prussian Monarchy, and the partition of Poland by the titled plunderers of the earlier Driebund. These great geographical facts have all been brought about in pursuance, exactly, of those principles which Machiavelli lays down for the guidance of his imaginary "Prince." The head of every one of those monarchies claims a sanction higher than any mere law of morality, as understood by private individuals, resting on the extinction of the minor moral code, and as much above it as the barbarian Roman emperor conceived himself to be above the laws of grammar. It is when we find ourselves face to face with those broad problems in the higher ethics that we are constrained to wonder

where the latitude and longitude of Mr. Morley's state morality may be sought for.

But there is a more bewildering element still in the situation which he has created by this remarkable study of the sardonic Italian. Looking for a contrast to Machiavelli, he finds it in the case of John Calvin! Having regard to Mr. Morley's Liberal antecedents, we might not unnaturally imagine that when the image of the great Genevese fanatic bobbed up in his brain, he must have exclaimed, "Of all men else I have avoided thee!" Calvin, he says, did in fact what Machiavelli tried to do on paper. Here we find a curious inversion of ideas on the part of the commentator, for Calvin, according to Mr. Morley, established his theocratic rule by the very means which Machiavelli despised—that is to say, by moral force alone. If we follow out his reasoning to its logical conclusion, we must find ourselves confronted with the proposition that the moral force on which Calvin rested his system would, in Machiavelli's opinion, be the absence of any such authority, for both were based on the entire disregard of private or even public opinion, and the assertion of despotic individual will. In his desire to bring forth an antithetical example, Mr. Morley, very curiously, uses terms which convey the idea that the same result may be achieved by diametrically opposite means—the rejection of moral force on the one hand, and the assertion of such a power on the other—a very singular illustration of the confusion into which even the clearest order of mind may be led by the endeavor to find a parallel abroad when one might much more easily be found nearer home. If men of Calvin's stamp might be taken as an illustration of this peculiar style of thesis, why not select Oliver Cromwell, if the writer was not afraid of alienating his political friends?

In the view of the historical philosopher, the march of events is to be scrutinized, not as the unfolding of a panorama, but as the elucidation of the scheme of human progress towards the highest goal. Personages and episodes are only the incidents which contribute to the sum. Mr. Morley has established a reputation for looking at things from this lofty point of view. He is seemingly without religious bias; in politics he is a Liberal of the Liberals. How, then, he could, by any rational process of thought, bring himself to regard the stern theocracy of Calvin as in any sense a thing to be admired is a bewildering puzzle. The dominance of any form of religion in state affairs is abhorrent to the Liberal creed. Yet here we find him, the arch-priest of English Liberalism, going into a guarded sort of ecstasy over the system set up by the most illiberal and intolerant bigot that ever got into power, and holding his system up to the admiration of

Oxford and the world as the single example of all that was great in opposition to Machiavelli's more honest notion of worldly statecraft! The fact is inconceivable and inexplicable.

Calvin, says Mr. Morley, "with a union of fervid religious instinct and profound political genius," did in fact what Machiavelli tried to do on paper. Had any one else suggested to the critic that such a combination was possible, Mr. Morley's scepticism must have suggested a courteous caution about the acceptance of the possibility. To him it must sound like a paradox to which time had lent no proof. Calvin's wonderful system, powerful, as Mr. Morley says, to withstand all the forces of Roman and Spanish reaction, left nothing but its spirit, once the breath had gone out of Calvin's body. The theocracy, based on Calvinism, is now the synonym of everything that is detestable, inhuman, revolting to the human mind. In Scotland it was tried under Calvin's disciple, Knox, and this gave to the Stuart movement its pith and main impetus. It came to these shores from England on board the Mayflower, and, therefore, we have on these free shores the reproach of imitation of European methods in dealing with the absurdity of witchcraft and the hypocritical Sabbatarianism which found expression in "blue laws." We fail to see the profound political wisdom which identified religion with all the prosecuting and punitive processes of the state. Here is the point upon which all defenders of the theocratic principle are divided, for the functions of Christianity are based upon mercy, while the civil power is supposed to exercise its office only in a deterrent spirit, and in the interests of the general welfare. The last man in the world to admire such a system, judging from his previous writings, ought to be Mr. Morley. His admiration, it is true, is only expressed in an academical sense. He himself would never form a member of a Calvin administration, did he live at such an epoch; but when he speaks of Roman and Spanish reaction we are free to infer that he believes Calvin was justified in the measures he took to outdo those powers in forcing theocratic government on the people. We understand the words "reaction" and "reactionary" in a bigoted, odious, and tyrannical sense. Could anything be more abhorrent than the rule under which the miserable inhabitants of Geneva groaned during the period when this awful "Reformer" sat in the high magisterial seat in Geneva?

At this remote period it is not easy to realize in its full forbidding repulsiveness the meaning of this cold-blooded system. We cannot better illustrate its blighting and searing effects upon the body politic than by quoting from the work of Mr. Boyd Winchester on the Swiss Constitution. This authority represented the United States at Bern for some years, and had ample oppor-

tunity, as an official and a gentleman of culture, of studying the country, the people, and their institutions. He is, we may well presume, a Protestant of some denomination. To this day, he says, the effects of Calvin's system are painfully visible. The various cantons of Switzerland are as distinct in their habits and beliefs as if they were inhabited by different races. And not only the various cantons, but the various cities, and not only the various cities, but their various quarters. Only the width of a street or a lane may separate people as hostile to each other, as suspicious, and as unsympathetic as alien races. All the hatreds engendered by the "Reformation" in urban and domestic life are there crystallized and insoluble as though some moral earthquake had precipitated them in distinct layers or particles. These are the enduring memorials of Calvin's influence, especially in Geneva. His influence still suffuses all that "Jerusalem of Switzerland." How strange that such a place comes to be described as the "impregnable fortress of modern liberty, fertile seed-plot of democracy"! While Calvin was sowing this seed of public freedom, all security of freedom, even in private and domestic life, was sapped by the working of his theocratic magisterial machine. The Church was personified in the constable and the bailiff, and there was not a single transaction of human life that did not come within the ken of an inflexible law. The heretic became a civil as well as an ecclesiastical offender, and we know the Brutus-like severity of Calvin's character from his dealing with his old friend Servetus. The charge that this master-spirit of human freedom even went out of his way to get his dialectical opponent into his clutches has not yet been refuted, and if it be finally sustained must stamp his inflexibility with a higher brand than that of the great classical model we have named.

But while the theocracy struck at high game, it by no means omitted the lesser from its purview. The city's records are full of details of the pettiest persecution for violations of its comprehensive sumptuary code no less than the Decalogue. While we read of children being beheaded for striking their parents, we learn of barbers being sent to prison for dressing the hair of brides in a way that savored too much of worldly vanity to the godly men who composed this modern Sanhedrim. The literature of the people was closely looked after, too. Men were sent to jail for reading works probably not more dangerous to faith and morals than some of Mr. Morley's. The Mosaic law was rigidly carried out in every detail that seemed to come within the meaning of the text. But, more monstrous and abominable than all the rest, we find that it did not draw the line at the tenderness of womanhood. Women who were found so heedless as to fit profane or secular

words to airs devoted to church hymnals were subjected to the outrage of the lash on their naked persons. Neither age nor sex was considered when the charge was an infraction of the Mosaic law. Much has been said and written about the espionage and the cruelty of the Inquisition, and this institution is one of the things Mr. Morley has in his mind when writing about Spanish reaction. It has never been charged against it that it sought to establish a sway like this—to pervade the whole life of the people as a fearful influence, become part and parcel of the public and the domestic life, to drill people into a mechanically religious habit, drive them out to church, regulate their pleasures, dictate their ballads and their choice of literature, violate the laws of nature and chivalry, and coerce all their lives into a cast-iron semblance of piety that shamed the hypocrisy of the Pharisees as regards, at least, minuteness, extent, and constancy.

In the whole range of psychological inquiry there is nothing more perplexing than the ingenuity which finds, in the fantastic tyrannies of Puritanism, the germs of political liberty as we see it developed in modern civilization. Truly, here is a case of sunbeams from cucumbers, if ever there were to be such distillation. Mr. Morley is by no means the only one who has found the rich pearl of constitutional freedom in the head of this ugly toad of Genevan despotism. Other writers, both English and American, have fallen into the same singular perversity of reasoning. We find Mr. Winchester extravagant in his praises of the political effects of the Reformation in Switzerland, concurrently with his admission of its glaring injustices and malign influences. Those influences remained in Geneva long after the baleful genius of Calvin had passed to another sphere. Down to 1839, the intolerant system he had founded flourished in the city and State, interposing barriers of adamant between the different sections of the people, and perpetuating the most demoralizing corruption, in order to preserve the clerical influence in all judicial and magisterial affairs. Then the people from outside, exasperated beyond all endurance, came in, and by one great, masterful effort, overthrew it. It did not fall by reason of Spanish reaction or Roman reaction, but simply by the revolt of human nature—Protestant human nature, be it noted—against a shocking and impious desecration of the name of religion.

Geneva was not the only place where this awful system reared itself on the ruins of the old civil society which had grown up side by side with Catholicism. It was by no means necessary for Mr. Morley to travel so far afield to find Machiavelli's ideas of government realized in a despotic theocracy. Presbyterianism in Scotland did much the same as Calvinism in Geneva. If Mr.

Morley only took up that unpretentious but eminently serviceable Presbyterian work, Mr. Chambers's "Domestic History of Scotland," he would find countless instances of the thoroughness, the pitilessness, and the absurdity of an ecclesiasticism from which no transaction of human life was sacred. The blazing fagot, the gibbet, the whipping-post, the boycot and the outlawry of Presbyterian rule make the chronicles of Scotland for the couple of centuries immediately succeeding the "Reformation" the most gruesome reading of all historical narration. During the Puritan *régimé* in "merrie England," the spirit of earnest emulation in the paths of Calvin and Knox was manifested so frankly as to pave the way for the *revanche* of the Restoration. Why were these two domestic examples of the theocratic system so completely overlooked by the learned author of the Romanes Lecture on Machiavelli? We have not the slightest suspicion that it was either through ignorance or forgetfulness, for no one doubts the extent and accuracy of Mr. Morley's scholarship. Neither have we any doubt of his honesty and sincerity. We can only attribute it to a singularity of judgment in the selection of examples in historical parallels. The illustration of Machiavellianism by a theocratic antithesis appears to us, indeed, a most infelicitous idea, all the more astonishing in the case of a student and essayist usually so forceful and philosophic as the accomplished author of this lecture. The indiscretions of youthful genius are excusable; those of mature age cannot be dismissed so complacently.

EDITOR.

BUDDHA AND HIS DOCTRINE.

THE early Christian missionaries who had been sent to India, China and Thibet were surprised to find, side by side with gross idolatry, a religious culture only possible among a people of considerable intellectual advancement. The reports and letters of these men are filled with enthusiastic accounts of a belief which they found there, and which was so strikingly like Christianity that they expressed in a confident manner the hope that the marvellous concurrence of Indic faith with the Christian doctrine would make the task of conversion an easy one. Strange were these accounts indeed. They tell of the use of holy water and the rosary, choirs, sacred images, tonsure, vestments, the bell in religious service, the orders of nuns and monks, and the vows of the monastic system. In the Lamaism of China and Thibet, which is an outgrowth of Buddhism, they even found, or thought to find, the doctrine of transubstantiation, the reverence to Virgin and Child, confessions, fasts, purgatory, abbots, cardinals, and even a tiara-crowned pope. The Christian world stood amazed. Travellers who had become more intimate with the creeds of the Chinese and Indians brought with them fragments of the Sacred Scriptures of these people which would not have been incongruous side by side with the tenets of the New Testament. Quasi-scientific treatises became plentiful. A motley patchwork of fragments, not even obtained from original texts—for these were still hidden from the Western World—were edited as true expositions of these creeds, and a host of writers sprang up who advanced theories, plausible enough, had they not been impressions derived from such an incomplete and inadequate source. Many there were who insisted that the analogy between Christianity and the eastern creeds, Buddhism more especially, was a conclusive proof that these were the sources of the former. For instance, much stress has been laid upon the assumption that the *Logos* doctrine was imported from India. It would indeed have been of great historical importance could this have been proven, but the history of the doctrine reveals nothing. We only know that *Vac*, speech or word, among the Indians, was, in the first instance, a goddess of the Vedic theogeny, which, at some later time, idealized by the Brahmins, was made an idea of primary importance in Brahminic mysticism. We find it used later by Heraclitus and the Stoics, in Philo and the Neo-Platonists, and

finally in the doctrine of St. John. However this doctrine may have crept into Greek systems, the assertion that the Logos of the Evangelist was derived from the Brahminic books is one more easily made than proven.

Speculations like this might have been passed as idle and harmless had not error kept pace with the truth. As Buddhism became known, it began to fill a peculiar purpose in the reasonings of Atheists and Agnostics. The tendency of this century has been to eliminate God, to deny the immortality of the soul, to subvert religion, and to build the social structure upon a basis of human reason. There was one obstacle which the non-believer could not overcome, namely, the impracticability of destroying, together with religion, morality itself; for he well knew that there must at least be a moral constraint upon the social body. Without religion, that is, without the belief in a God and a future state, how would it be possible to maintain morality? Theoretically, the possibility had been demonstrated. Had not Voltaire, almost a century ago, established a purely atheistic basis for morality, and was not Spencer's system of ethics an admirable theory? Yet the world needed an example before it could accept a moral code without a God and a future life as a safe basis. Atheism and Agnosticism are the scientific premises which have communism and even anarchy as necessary conclusions; and all the theorization of infidel thinkers had not convinced the masses that these would not be dangerous experiments. Behold, in the East, a practical demonstration of the feasibility of such a condition of things! Here was a religion Atheistic or Agnostic, and even Nihilistic, and behold, its moral code is excellent, its tenets have been promulgated over more than half the world. Are there not five hundred million Buddhists? The wild hordes on the table-lands of Nepal Tartary and Thibet, the vast population of China and of the peninsula of Korea, the Japanese, the Siamese, the Singalese, and even the inhabitants of the Javanese Archipelago, have followed the doctrine of Buddha. Has not this apostle, who well may be called the "Light of Asia," implanted in all these millions the spirit of benevolence, righteousness, and social order? The Buddhist cult is remarkably like the Christian faith, even in its outward signs. The moral law which Buddha has taught is older than the law of Christ, and so like it in its conception, as well as its results, that the conclusion has been arrived at that Christianity has been borrowed from the East. "Is it not evident," cries out Schopenhauer, "that long before the days of the Nazarene—even before Alexander stood on the banks of the Indus—the monk Gotama had gathered eternal truths from Scriptures more ancient than the Hebrew Songs and Chronicles? Christianity is a pla-

giarism, Christ an imitation. Buddha is the reality; the Prince of Kapliavastu and his doctrines are genuine; Christianity is nothing more than Buddhism grafted upon Judaism."[1]

The number of Buddhist adherents, even though we include every modern perversion of the Buddhist doctrine, is extremely problematical, for the reason that a census or classification of the people according to their religious tenets has never been held in the countries where that religion is prevalent. Dr. Kellogg, who has written an admirable book on Buddhism, estimates the number at seventy-three millions. De Harlez[2] is of the opinion that if we were only to count those as Buddhists who would unequivocally confess themselves to be such, the number would shrink to a few hundred thousands. It is very difficult to find in modern India or China a sect which in the true sense of the word can be called Buddhist. Modern Lamaism, which is by far the most extended creed in China, has little of the original moral worth which Schopenhauer so much admires in Buddhism. J. Gilmour, the English traveller, says that the Mongolians have been morally corrupted by Buddhism. "The great sinners in Mongolia are the Lamas, the great centres of wickedness are the temples. It is the system which makes the Lamas, and places them in hot-beds of vice."[3] The Protestant Bishop Schereschewsky writes: "For more than twenty years I have studied Buddhism. I have thoroughly read the Buddhistic books, I have conversed with hundreds of Chinese, Mongolians and Thibetan priests and monks, I have visited many Buddhist temples, ... and I feel justified in stating that never has any false religion foisted upon mankind a more monstrous system of hypocrisy and idolatry." Dr. Edkins, in his work on Chinese Buddhism, declares that the Buddhist system of morals, as it is known in China, is powerless to elevate its adherents to any degree of morality; that what there is of virtue among the Chinese is due to Confucianism. St. Francis Xavier found the same woeful condition in Japan. Corruption came from the nuns and monks themselves; so that the people justified their own immorality by laying grosser charges at the door of the religious.[4] Do we find a better condition in India, the cradle of Buddhism, and the home of the admirable metaphysics of the Brahmins? It is difficult for the student to conceive that modern Hinduism has any connection whatever with the religion of the Upanishad. For the most part, it is base idolatry. Cruelty to a degree of savagery marks its religious rites. Faith in India seems to have completed a circle, landing once more in polytheism. The world of lower

[1] *Parerga*, 3d ed., vol. ii., p. 407.
[2] *La Science Catholique.*
[3] *Among the Mongoles.* J. Gilmour.
[4] *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.* E. de Vos, 1877.

organisms has survived. All that remains worthy of attention are the sacred books. Buddhism has shared the same fate where it has not been crushed out by Hinduism. It has become base idolatry. It is the image of Buddha which is adored; the power of the teacher has passed away.

This is the religion pure, perhaps, in its source, but prostituted in centuries of application to abominable uses, which modern atheists declare to be a fitting substitute for Christianity. If men like Rhys Davids, whose self-sacrificing labor the world truly appreciates, have found in Buddhism the religion which comes nearest our own, we must ascribe it, not to the modern phases of that faith, but to the idealized conception of the same as it exists in the Sacred Canons alone. The fact that there are resemblances between the law of Christ and the law of Buddha does not logically lead to the conclusion that the one is kindred to the other. Schopenhauer is no authority upon the subject. It is doubtful if he ever translated one line of the Pali-books or of the Sanskrit Scriptures. Even Rhys Davids, whose admiration for Buddhism has led him to over-estimate its influence or power, warns us against apparent resemblances between passages in the Pali-Pitakas and in the New Testament. That like passages do exist he does not deny; but he emphatically adds that it is a palpable error to deduce from this coincidence an historic connection, or to conclude that the New Testament, as the more recent Scriptures, has borrowed from the Pali-books. Where such resemblances exist,—and often they are least when at first reading they seem greatest,—it is principally due to an analogy in the circumstances which gave rise to two similar movements. The seeming resemblance of Buddha and his doctrine to Christ and his teaching has, nevertheless, furnished the opponents of Christianity with a weapon of attack. The manner of connection between the two, or of the possible derivation of the one from the other, does not concern those who wish to see in such resemblances a weapon against Christianity. For them, the fact that both have much in common is a sufficient basis for a refutation of the whole scheme of the Christian faith. They argue, *Post hoc ergo propter hoc;* cleverly disguising the fact that the Eastern Scriptures constitute a field of knowledge comparatively unknown, and that it is even now impossible to establish their historic position or significance.

The reader must bear in mind that up to the year 1870 only two Pali-texts (which alone can be relied upon as authenthic) of any size or importance had appeared in editions accessible to scholars in the West, and that, of these two, only one was a book out of the Buddhist Scriptures. Since then the research has been going on, and many of the books have been translated and annotated.

What the world knows of them has been derived from a patient analysis of the Scriptures themselves, for there is no extraneous light which can illumine passages which are dark or ambiguous. India furnishes no historic context to its literature, for it is a land without history or oratory. The sequence of the books must ever remain a conjecture. The best that can be done is to take the matter recorded through the centuries as the true utterance of one who lived and taught long before even the first of the books was written; but as authority to refute that which the world has accepted as historically true, these are not sufficient. A more reliable premise is needed to impeach Christ and Christianity.

Properly to understand Buddhism, it is necessary to understand the system of thought out of which it was evolved, and to regard its founder, not as an isolated teacher of new truths, but as an expounder of the religious philosophy which for centuries has grown over the Indian life, tinging mind and soul with its sombre hues. Buddha, of the caste of the Katshyras, or warrior caste, was educated by the Brahmins, to whom alone was relegated the instruction of youth. His was the Vedic belief. The law which regulated his life was the law of the Brahmin. To understand Buddhism we must first enter upon an understanding of the Brahminical idea. If in Buddhism the grand attempt has been made to evolve a redemption in which man himself is the redeemer, to create a faith without God, Brahminic speculation had well prepared the ground for this purpose. Step by step it had crowded the idea of God back into oblivion, annihilating the idols of old, until beside a vague impersonal all-pervading power resting above things earthly, man alone remained to evolve from within himself the scheme of redemption by overcoming all suffering and pain. Would we understand the Buddhist system, we must think the thoughts of its founder; love, fear and admire with him—this we must do to arrive at an appreciative understanding of a religion, if so it may be called, that has grown through ages, adapting itself in endless changes to the mind of a people which has developed in isolation from the rest of the world.

Nowhere is more forcibly demonstrated the influence which religion can wield over the development of a race, and over its loftiest aspirations, than in India; nowhere more forcibly the intellectual and religious fate of a people who have substituted, like the Brahmin Ritualists, form for spirit, like the Vedantists; ideas for ideals, and emotions for morality. The Vedic belief, at the time when Buddha taught, was without the idea of God, of immortality or of a future state of existence. Brahminic theology had been one journey, made with rests and halts, it is true, and even with digressions from the straight path, but without abate-

ment of intent and without permanent change of direction, from an objective polytheism to an abstruse mysticism, sustained only by Brahminic ritualism into which the idea of God was no longer admitted. If the idea of divinity entered into this religion at all, it was divested of all attributes of supremacy, and the gods were regarded as an order of beings different from the creatures of the visible world, but having no manner of ascendancy or control over them.

Time was when the religion of the Indian was a chaotic adoration of natural phenomena as living powers—when Indra, the god who wields the storm and the lightning, the mightiest of the gods, filling the universe, the heavens resting upon his head, earth and heaven trembling at his breath; when Surya Savitar (Sol, ἡλιος), shining in the heavens, life-giving and life-destroying; when Varuna (ουρανος), the god of a thousand eyes, the sin-forgiving god, who causes heaven and earth to stand firm and the stars to retain their places—when these were realities to him which he feared and adored, and with which he held direct communion by intercession and propitiatory sacrifices. The early Vedic hymns breathe the same spirit as the battle-song of the Teuton. Indra is Thor, Savitar is Wodan. With the centuries, however, the Indian has learned to regard the natural and supernatural in this world from a different point of view, and imperceptibly a change is instilled into this theogeny. In the Brahmanas, written centuries after the Rig Veda, man subdues the gods, until finally, in the Upanishads, man ignores them and becomes himself like God. "There are two kinds of gods; for the gods are gods, and the priests that are learned in the Vedas and who teach it are human gods." This sentence is taken from the "Brahmana of the Hundred Paths," one of the most important Hindu books. There may be latent in the people a deep religious spirit, but it is not the spirit which actuated the Indo-Aryan on the banks of the Caspian Sea. Since his migration south, faith had been overcast with an obscuring cloud of ritualism; the priests had assumed a pharisaical mask, and strove more for the furtherance of their rites than for the perfection of the race. The Indian was once a man of action, but in the land of the Indus and the Ganges he had changed his nature, and with it the nature of his belief. The interests and ideals which were once the basis of national thought and of national life existed no longer for him. Desire and activity were overgrown by idle speculation and dreaming. The true relation between the spiritual and the real was destroyed; thought itself became distorted; the world about him was peopled with the weird phantasms of his own brain, and life and happiness on earth were crushed beneath diseased fancies. This had Brahminic

speculation accomplished. Religion, henceforth, was to the Indian incomprehensible. He could not shake off the consciousness of a Supreme Being, and in plaintive song he cries out:

> "Who gave us life, who gave us strength of being,
> Whose mighty words the eternal gods obey,
> Whose shadow immortality or death is,
> Who is the god to whom we render tribute?"

He knew not. Mystified he stood at the sacrificial shrine, doubt within his breast, dissatisfied with all things. In the moist and sultry climate of Hindostan, he still remembered the winters in a land far north, where among the snow-clad mountains his gods and holy singers had their habitation; but "having in his childish way striven to pierce beyond the limits of this finite world," he has given to those gods a mystic significance, having reduced them to nominal fractions of an incomprehensible power, and preserves them only for ritualistic purposes.

The divinity of the Brahmins was the product of reflection. Indra remained, but yielded to a higher power. The god that the priests thought out became the all-god. This was not a personal god, but rather the principle by which or through which all things subsisted. It was the breath of life, the Atman, which contained all life-force and functions, and which was the central and creative force of the universe. "Atman is the all; with this Atman I will, when I depart hence, be united. Brahma is its expression." Megasthenes, the Greek who three hundred years before the birth of Christ came with Alexander into India, stands in wonderment at the life of a race so different from his own. At home the Greek abandons the plough to take up the sword. It is his part to do. In him lives the spirit of Achilles and Agamemnon. The blood in his veins is a warm, turbulent blood. Here the historian found a people in whom the fire of ambition had smouldered into ashes. The Indian had long since forgotten the interests and ideals of his European brother. Not for him were conquest or warlike fame. He sits him down upon his ploughshare to think. Of what? Of its offspring, Soma and Agni, of Soma-offering and Agni-offering. Will and action have become submerged in phantasm, and the mind by gradations has received that impression of sorrow and disease which has become the heritage of his race.

This trait in the Indian character was due to the influence of the philosophical order, as Megasthenes names the Brahmins—an order which was more than a vain and greedy priestcraft, and which had with time become the very genius of the people. The Brahmins were superior to the people; they were divine; they acknowledged no earthly authority. When, in the face of the mul-

titude, the king was anointed by them, "This is your king, O people," they declared; "the king over us Brahmins is Soma." Sprung from the family of Rishis, who composed the Vedic hymns, and in whom alone was vested the sacrificial privilege, they retained control of the sacred books, which were wholly traditional in the beginning, and in consequence they alone were familiar with the most sacred rites required at the sacrifice. They gathered the hymns and traditions of the people, interpolating much to augment their own power, until there was scarcely a trace of chronological distinction between the Rig Veda and the books which follow. In their knowledge lay the secret of their supremacy; for understanding, they declared, is the all-subduing power. "Mighty doth he become, and powerless his enemy, who possesses such knowledge." To them alone belonged the right of teaching and expounding the sacred texts, and also the right to determine the law of caste. The Vashya, or rural caste, the Kashatrya, or warrior caste, might read the Vedas, but only so far as they were taught and explained by the Brahmins. The young Indian of Aryan birth who was not brought at a proper age to a Brahmin teacher to be instructed in the wisdom of the Vedas was considered an outcast. "Into my control," says the Brahmin, "I take thy heart; let thy thought follow my thought; with all thy soul rejoice in my word." Coerced in the master's house, he finally emerged from the tutelage of the priests wrapped in a strange egotism, with a confused conception of the limit between the real and the unreal, his mind, full of airy speculations, shapeless and distorted. The method which he there acquired was an inexplicable groping in darkness, a restless desire to comprehend self and the universe, which nowhere in the world finds a parallel. Into his serious world of thought entered the one conviction which he deeply felt and to which he gave expression: that all things earthly are full of suffering and that there is only one salvation—renunciation and eternal rest.

It must not be forgotten that Gotama, the Buddha, was born, brought up, and lived and died a Hindu. His teaching, far-reaching and original as it was, was Indian throughout. Without the intellectual influence of the Brahmins his work would have been meaningless and impossible. His system was essentially an Indian system, and however it may differ from Brahminism, it was from this source that it derived its elements. In his public life he had constant intercourse with the most cultured and earnest thinkers of India. Wherever he went it was the Brahmins themselves who took the most earnest interest in his speculations, and many of his chief disciples were of the Brahmin caste.

At the foot of the Nepal hills, far to the east of the cradle

of Brahminism, in the city of Kapilavastu, the ruins of which have long since been lost, Siddartha, a noble of the Sakya (powerful) nation, spent his days in opulence and self-indulgence, until, sated, he turned in disgust from the pleasures of this world to a life of abnegation and poverty. He had drunk deeply of the cup of life and was surfeited. He had tasted all the sensual pleasures of the world and had grown weary of them. According to the Lalila Vistara, all the splendor which oriental ingenuity could devise surrounded him, and, like a god among heavenly nymphs, he lived, with his three hundred wives and myriad concubines, in sumptuous palaces, soothed by ravishing tones of invisible music. He remembered the teachings of his Brahmin masters; he had heard them discourse on the vanities of life, on the emptiness of desire, and upon Nirvana; and in the midst of his pleasures he longed for that annihilation which he had been taught was the consummation of all to be desired. No doubt he had seen at the palace gates the ascetic monks of the age who were striving to attain perfection by self-chastisement and abnegation, and who, in obedience to the precepts of Brahmana, sought in this manner to rid themselves of lusts, of evil, and of Karma, hoping to attain the end of cravings, the absence of passion, peace, Nirvana. He, too, would assume the garb of a beggar. "Knowing Atman, relinquish desire for progeny, for property and worldly joys, and wander about like a beggar." He had been taught that human nature depends on desire. "From his desire," say the sacred Brahmanas, "will flow his endeavor; according to his endeavor will be the deeds (Karmen) which he performs, and these are the sum of existence." To rid himself of desire then must be his future task; only when he has conquered this can he know Atman. "When man knows Atman why should he cling to things earthly? The first step is understanding; when it has been attained desire will vanish." He was twenty-nine years old, when, cutting off hair and beard, he clothed himself in a loose, yellow garment, and went from home to homelessness, to be known thereafter as the monk Gotama.

Thus he was fulfilling the laws of the Brahmins. The law-books divided the life of the good Brahmin into three stages: The first of these, that of a student, he had attained in his youth; he had passed through the second, the family life, for according to the more authentic records he had at this time a wife and an infant son; and now it remained for him to live in the forest as a recluse, a life of meditation. Accordingly, in the woods of Uravela (Buddha Gaya, south of Patua), on the river Nerangara (Phalyn), he spent six years in severe chastisement and fasting. The en-

lightenment which he sought, however, did not come to him; and one day, weak with hunger, having fallen in a faint to the ground, he resolved to lead a life less severe, and partaking again of rich food, he warned his fellow-hermits against self-abnegation, as a species of desire. "He, the sublime, spoke to the five monks. Two extremes there are: The one is a life of lust, given to pleasure and enjoyment; this is low, ignoble, unspiritual, useless; the other is a life of self-torture—this is sad, unworthy, useless." (Oldenburg Buddha.) Doubting his motives, his disciples forsook him, leaving him to pursue his new method alone. It is useless to dwell on this period of preparation. It is known that many, in direct consequence of the methods inculcated by Brahmin teachers, finding nothing in their life worth the living, when meted by the dark philosophy of the sacred books, resigned the pleasures of the world, and by ascetic training sought to prepare for the one object, unattainable in a world of strife and desire, complete surcease of sorrow and of pain. The doctrine of the Retreat had long been a favorite one, not only among the Brahmins, but among the numerous Hindu sects, which professed, each in a different way, to solve the mystery of salvation.

During the four times seven days which he spent under a certain tree, since known as the Tree of Knowledge, came Mara, the tempter, to persuade him to enter Nirvana without making disciples, suggesting to him that it was folly to reveal to others what he had attained by incessant struggle. "Truth will be hidden from him who is filled by hatred and desire; toilsome, mysterious, deeply hidden from the senses, is this truth, and he cannot perceive it whose senses are filled with the darkness of earthly striving." (Oldenburg.) Buddha, however, remained true to the object which he had set for himself, and Mara was foiled. At last came to his aid Brahma Sahaspati, from the heaven of the Brahmas, to beg him to continue in his mission and not to give way to doubt or hesitation.

The tendency to find a similarity between the life of Buddha and that of Christ has in no small measure been stimulated by Edwin Arnold's poem, "The Light of Asia." It is well to bear in mind, however, that Arnold's poem was not written with any pretence to scientific truth or exactitude, but rather that it has been the effort of the poet to denude the legend of Buddha, as it is found in the Lalila Vistara, of the extravagant myths, and to familiarize it to Christian readers by presenting it in a garb more Christian and far more natural. There is little of truth to be gleaned from the later authorities, to which the Lalila Vistara belongs. A degree of accuracy can only be obtained by adhering to the most ancient authority, the Pali tradition of Ceylon, which

contains no life of Buddha, but only fragmentary sketches, concomitant with his teachings. From these we learn nothing more than the fact that Buddha, to attain enlightenment, fasted for a protracted period. The later exaggerated narratives of Buddha's life and teachings, interwoven as they are with fantastic myths, are of no more authority than are the Apocryphal Gospels an authoritative rendition of the true life of Jesus Christ.

We leave it to the reader to find in the circumstances surrounding the birth and youth of Siddartha any similarity to the birth and youth of Christ. The Saviour was a carpenter's son; Buddha, if not a prince, the offspring of an aristocratic house. Tradition, or the sacred books, admit that he was reared in opulence, and that he was given to dissipation. Of Jesus, it is only known that he lived at Nazareth, an insignificant town in the north of Galilee, growing in wisdom as in age. Let them cavil, if they will, over the authenticity of His mission, the fact remains there is more in the simple statement of Matthew than in all the embellished discourses of infidels who are reading the inscriptions of history through prismatic glasses. Great stress is laid upon Siddartha's visit to the temple while a child, but is there one, of all who are earnestly striving for truth, that will accept this tradition, with the myths which surround it, in its source? Will it pass current with the statement in the Lalila Vistara, where alone it is found, that 1,000,000 gods drew the chariot of the child, while the heavenly nymphs strewed flowers in his path?

Most remarkable at first glance is the fact that Buddha, like Christ before entering upon His mission, was tempted by the evil spirit. Let us bear in mind, however, that the old Pali texts do not connect the meeting of Mara and Buddha with this time of preparation. Later authorities describe it in so grotesque a manner that there is no trace of similarity to the temptation of Christ. Mara comes at the head of an army of demons, surrounding him above and below and for miles about. He rides upon the elephant Grimikhala, which measures several hundred miles. The gods which surround Buddha fly in terror. To instil into Buddha this same fear is Mara's aim. He conjures up storms and floods, and showers of stones, and swords, and glowing ashes; but Buddha is not intimidated, and the evil one must retreat. In Maha-Barinibbana-Sutta is the following version, narrated by Buddha himself: "At one time I sat beneath the tree of the shepherd Nigrodha, upon the banks of the Nerangara, soon after I had been enlightened, and there came Mara, the evil one, to the place where I sat, and standing by my side spake these words: 'Now go thy way, O Lord, out of existence; mayest thou, holy one, now die; now is the time for the holy one to die.'" To this Buddha

replied that he did not desire to die, and thus ended the temptation.[1] The only analogy between the two temptations consists in the idea that in both cases the evil one resists the redemption of mankind; but this idea is peculiar neither to Buddhism nor Christianity, but is as old as the religious life of mankind.

Having overcome the temptation by Mara, he attains enlightenment; the monk Gotama becomes Buddha, "the Enlightened." Of this he speaks: "When I learned this and when I beheld this my soul was released from the sin of desire, released from the sin of earthly being, released from the sin of ignorance (not knowing). In the redeemed awakened the knowledge of his redemption. Annihilated is regeneration; fulfilled the holy pilgrimage. Done is the duty. I will not return again to this world, that I know."

He went forth to preach, and at Benares he delivered to the five monks who, in the forest of Urevela, had deserted him at a time when he was most in need of the tender trust and respect of faithful followers, the sermon which contains the fundamental principles in Buddhism.

He taught them to seek the middle way; neither to indulge in the pleasures of sense and sensuality, nor by extreme self-mortification to weaken the body or dull all sensibility. "And which is that middle way? Verily, it is the noble eightfold path:

"Right views (free from superstition or delusion).

"Right aspirations (high and worthy of the intelligent worthy man).

"Right speech (kindly, open, truthful).

"Right conduct (peaceful, honest, pure).

"Right living (bringing hurt or danger to no living thing).

"Right effort (in self-training and in self-control).

"Right mindfulness (the active, watchful mind).

"Right rapture (in deep meditation on the realities of life)."[2]

He further instructed them concerning the Four Truths, which are not among the doctrines handed down, but which it was given him first to see, then to know, and perfectly to understand.

"This, O recluses, is the noble truth concerning suffering. Birth is painful, and so is old age; disease is painful, and so is death. Union with the unpleasant is painful; painful is separation from the pleasant; and any craving that is unsatisfied, that too is painful. In brief, the five aggregates which spring from attachment (the conditions of individuality and its cause), they are painful.

---

[1] *Vid. S. B. E.*, vol. ii., page 52, *et seq.*

[2] Rhys Davids.

"Now this, O recluses, is the noble truth concerning the origin of suffering. Verily it originates in that craving thirst which causes the renewal of becomings, is accompanied by sensual delight, and seeks satisfaction now here, now there; that is to say, the craving for the gratification of the passions, or the craving for a future life, or the craving for success in this present life.

"Now this, O recluses, is the noble truth concerning the destruction of suffering. Verily it is the destruction in which no craving remains over of this very thirst; the laying aside of, the getting rid of, the being free from, the harboring no longer of this thirst.

"And this, O recluses, is the noble truth concerning the way which leads to the destruction of suffering. Verily, it is the noble eightfold path."

Buddha made no distinction of caste. To him the lowest was equal to the highest. It was supremely necessary to understand, in its fullest meaning, the reasoning set forth in this sermon of Benares. Only the ignorant were excluded, not the lowly. Before his time, only the sages of the priestly caste could attain perfect happiness, and even for them the path lay through life-long torture; the common people knew religion only as a formula of rites in which they were not interested, because they understood them not. What wonder that the age of Buddha was an age of schisms! The priests, in the eyes of the people, were insincere; at least, they were unsympathetic.

It is evident that the times were ripe for a more humane religion. Buddha spake as one of the people when he declared to his followers: "He that is pure in heart is the true priest; not he that knows the Vedas. Like unto one that standeth where a king hath stood and spoken, and standing and speaking thus, deems himself for this a king, seems to me the man that repeateth the hymns, which the wise men of old have spoken, and standing in their place and speaking deems himself for this a sage. The priests are of no account, save as they be morally of repute. This is the foundation of wisdom—to restrain desire, to be satisfied with little. He is a holy man who doeth this. Knowledge follows this."

One thing was necessary, to enter upon the eightfold path, and to understand the truth. The human will is bound by fetters which must be broken. The first of these is delusion of self. Buddha maintains that it is a delusion to consider ourselves separate from existing things, or even from those which have been or are to be. Man is but a link in an endless chain. He has no individuality; he will pass away, leaving nothing but the result of his existence. The second fetter to be broken is that of doubt.

He must put implicit faith in the Dhamma, or the Law, and in him, Buddha, its expounder. Another fetter is the folly of placing too much weight upon the efficacy of good works and ceremonies.

Having overcome these three delusions of self, doubt, and reliance upon works and ceremonies, the Buddhist has entered upon the way of salvation, and can never be turned back. It finally remains for him to break the fetter (4) of sensuality, (5) of ill-will, (6) of the love of earthly life, (7) of desire for a future life, (8) of pride, (9) of self-righteousness, and (10) of ignorance, and having done this he attains Nirvana.

This is the essence of Buddhism, a religion entirely independent of a Supreme Being, of a future life, and of a relation to fellow-beings, inasmuch as these are not useful to the attainment of self-perfection. There is surely no analogy between this ethical creed and the sublime doctrine of Christ. Christianity is the gospel of love. Buddhism the gospel of selfishness. Christianity holds aloft the light of hope in a future life. Buddhism plunges mankind into hopeless annihilation. Of the redemption, of the sorrow and pain from which we are to be redeemed, of the manner in which this redemption is to be accomplished, the preaching of Buddha treats, and of nothing else. God and the world do not concern him; his whole attention is wrapped up in the one effort, to be rid of pain. Christ preaches essentially the love of God, and the love of one's neighbor for the sake of God. God is the centre of all Christian desire. What we do or omit, that we do or omit because it pleases Him. To the Christian, man is as nothing and God is all; to the Buddhist, God is nothing and self is all. Self must be delivered from suffering, not through the grace of God or of the gods, not through the mediation of a redeemer, but man through his knowledge of self must work out his own redemption; he must understand the natural law of development, and by a wise application of this knowledge withdraw from the disastrous result of that law. Buddha is not an atheist, but an agnostic. He does not deny the existence of a God, he simply evades the issue. Max Müller declares that there is not one passage in the canonical books which in the least indicates a belief in a personal God or Creator. Why should he, who has repeatedly declared that redemption comes from within, and is wholly the result of individual effort, even suggest the idea of God? Long before his day the idea of a Supreme Being, if not obsolete, had at least become problematical, and the idea of an all-pervading force which had assimilated the whole pantheon of a remote antiquity was indeed so vague that it suggested nothing to the mind.

The contrast between Christianity and Buddhism does not end

here. Never can two faiths result one from the other in which the end of one is diametrically opposed to the end of the other. To the Christian a future existence, a fulfilment of all desires, an eternal enjoyment of perfect happiness, is the end of existence. To the Buddhist, absence of all desire, not by fruition, but by the exclusion of desire—eternal rest, not in enjoyment of happiness, but in oblivion of pain—is the *summum bonum*. In a letter written nearly half a century ago, and published in the "Times," of London, the theory held by M. Müller in an early essay on Buddhism that Nirvana means non-existence had been emphatically controverted, and the assertion made that Nirvana means the absorption of the individual soul by the divine essence, and not total annihilation. Much has been written in support of this assertion. Were this true, then either the existence of a personal God, or the absorption of individuality in that vague force to which all things are subservient, must have been an essential tenet of Buddhism. Miller, Oldenburg, Hardy, Elkins and Rhys Davids acknowledge the agnostic character of Buddha's teaching. Buddha knows no God; to him the highest is man perfected. Does he, then, consider the absorption of man's individual nature in the world-force as the one thing to be obtained, as Nirvana?

The Nun Vadshira, whose temptation by Mara the demon is described, answers the tempter thus: "This, I, is but a sum of appearances. You do not here find a person; just as, for the parts which constitute a wagon, when put together one uses the word, wagon, so also, where the 'five groups' (appearances) are present, there is the person." This rather metaphysical statement is nothing more than the reiteration of an old Brahminical idea that nothing which exists is real, that all things in nature which the senses perceive are appearances. Prof. Kern, in his work on "Buddhism," believes the true meaning of this doctrine to be that individuality in the living of the lifeless does not exist except as an idea, a name, or an expression. And if all which is ever changing is designated as being or existing, this must not be regarded as metaphysically exact.[1]

In the "Sabasava Sutta" it is written that it is a fallacy to say "I have a self; this ego is permanent, eternal, has the intrinsic power never to change, continuing for ever and ever. This, my brethren, is the way of delusion, the thicket of delusion, the forest of delusion, the play of delusion, the fetters of delusion; the unwise unconverted man can never be liberated from birth, decay and death."[2] It is declared in the Scriptures that every being has its Namarupa (name and form), which is the sum of all appearances

---

[1] Kern, *Buddhism*, i., page 455, *et seq.*

[2] *Vid. S. B. E.*, xi., 299.

which constitute personality. Through Namarupa one does good works or evil, and through these works begins the existence of another Namarupa.[1] Thus, it is explained, the flame of the lamp ignites the straw, and the flames of the straw ignite the house; but the flames of the lamp are not the same as the flames of the straw, and these are not the same as the flames of the house. Even so the person who does good or an evil deed is another than the person who reaps the fruit thereof. More plainly expressed, the theory is that each human life is merely the link in a long chain of cause and effect; that each link is the result of what has gone before, and will mould the one which is to follow. Merit, or Karma, as the Buddhist calls it, is all that survives after death, and will advance, not the being—the Namarupa—who accumulates this merit, but the result of all which one being has done in a term of existence will invest another who has no conscious identity with himself.

In Buddhism there is no transmigration of souls in the accepted meaning of the term. After death a being is destroyed; another one is called into life. The chain of continuity is a migration of Karma. That which constitutes personality passes away, for it is nothing but a conception of that union of appearances which constitute the individual. It is merit which lives, which is part of Dharma (the world-force), which is never lost but can be overcome only by the struggle of man in the world of expiation. When evil has been overcome, when man has crushed it, when the mind has become clear in the understanding of truth, there is no longer need of existence, no longer need of an union of appearances for the sake of further expiation. Man perfected sinks into nothingness, absolute and external. Weary is the spirit of the Indian, seeking rest, eternal rest—rest without fruition, rest without hope and without love. The Christian, too, seeks rest, but it is that rest which he finds in a full knowledge and love of the Divine, so perfect and complete that further strife is needless.[2]

Buddhism, then, is a religion without God, and without immortality. Stripped of equivocation and of poetic detail, it is nothing but miserable agnosticism, and yet there are those who would compare it to the doctrine of Jesus Christ. How vain the taunt that Christ was a disciple of Buddha, that every word of the Gospels was borne from the East! Even granting that Christ was familiar with Buddhism, is there aught, beyond the moral law implanted by nature in our breasts, which in the former approaches the teachings of the Saviour? The principles of morality are the

[1] Kellogg.

[2] Comp. *Childers' Pali Dict.*, "*Nibbanam*," Rhys Davids' *Buddhism*, Kern, *Buddhism, et al.*

same in the breast of the African savage and in the breast of the enlightened European. Nature in the one may be perverted to such an extent as to crush all moral instinct, but the moral law has been written in the soul by the finger of God in the beginning, and if the Indian after centuries has read this law according to his nature, need we marvel to find much therein analogous to the Christian doctrine?

What is the moral effect of this religion without God and immortality? There are many expressions in the canonical writings which, gathered together, would indeed make an excellent moral code; but there is also much which is contrary to our moral conception and to all reason. "Strive to become Buddha," is the fundamental principle of Buddhism. There is nothing in all the universe which is desirable save the liberation of self. Therefore it is taught in "Dhamapada," page 379, "Let self urge on self, let self try self, and watching over self you will live happily, oh, monk; for self is the vanquisher of self; self is the refuge of self; therefore control self as a merchant would his noble steed." Buddhism is essentially the religion of selfishness. Personal deliverance from all suffering is the aim of the Buddhist, and only that is useful which is subservient to this end. He may not hate his neighbor, for hatred is desire, and desire hinders him in attaining Nirvana. For the same reason he may not love his neighbor; for love, too, is desire. "Those alone who neither hate nor love have no fetters."[1] Kindness, mercy and benevolence are recommended, not through motives of love, but through a motive of utility, for reflection assured him that they are better than cruelty and tyranny. If Buddhism teaches the forgiveness of wrong, it is easily perceived that this forgiveness is not incited by a love of enemies, but by the fact that reconciliation and forgiveness are more convenient than revenge. As it is with love, so it is with all virtues. They have no intrinsic value. A virtuous life is good because it is useful in the attainment of the highest knowledge and Nirvana. "Him I call truly wise who in this world is lifted above good and evil, lifted above the submission to either."[2] "He who regards virtue, or a life of virtue, as the highest end to be attained in this world, is rebuked by the sacred books, for the loss of it would cause man to suffer; he yearns and prays for it like one who has lost his caravan or has wandered from his home. It creates in him desire."[3] "Acts are to be avoided, for every kind of act is impelled by some motive of love or hate (rajas), and as rajas colors a pure and upright existence, tarnishes it more or less, therefore must he who strives to avoid all impurity act as

[1] *Dhamapada.*
[2] *Dhamapada.*
[3] *Sutta Nipata.* Vid Müller, S. B. E.

little as possible."[1] "Not faith, strengthened by works, not hope in a reward for the good accomplished in this world, not charity to his neighbor, nothing that comprises the great motive of Christian works, is an incentive to the follower of Buddha. It is only essential for him to comprehend the four truths in order to attain perfection and Nirvana; it is only necessary for him to walk in the eightfold path. Righteousness is the lowest degree of moral worth; far higher is meditation and self-contemplation, and highest is wisdom. Morality has worth only as it is useful to an end, in this world, to the enjoyment of a happy life, and to the final absolute end, deliverance."[2]

Buddhism is not for the poor in spirit, and in this particular it is the opposite of Christianity. The religion of Christ is for all—the lowliest as well as the most enlightened. Being a gospel of love, it comprehends humanity in its all-engrossing scope. Not only he whose mind can comprehend the abstract notions of a speculative belief, but all who are capable of a simple, earnest belief in a loving God, and of a desire to attain by righteous living a union with Him in the life beyond, may reach eternal happiness. Not so the Buddhist. His salvation depends upon knowledge. The gospel preached to him is a mass of abstruse, speculative sophism. Can his understanding grasp it? If so, he may attain enlightenment; otherwise, salvation is not for him. He who is burdened with cares of this world, who has entered upon the fierce struggle of existence for himself, for his wife, and for his children, finds little time or occasion for sophistic speculation, which, according to Buddha himself, will only, after years of severe application, lead to the desired result. Therefore, it is declared that the law is not for those who lead a family life.[3] "Family life is suffering, is the seat of impurity. Only he who leads a monastic life can avoid sin." "From a family life comes contamination." "He alone is wise who wanders about homeless, who has resigned all service to his fellow-man, who has lifted himself above the serving of gods, who is free from all service, and whose path is known neither to the gods, to the demons, nor to the men."[4] Not for him who is a member of the family, nor even to him who clings to the social order, is salvation, but for him who isolates himself from the rest of humankind, becoming an outcast and a beggar. If he crush the love for his wife and child out of his heart, if he learn to regard all men with absolute indifference, if he break all social ties, the consolation remains for him that his merit will in another existence invest something else with a fuller

---

[1] Kern.
[2] Oldenburg, *Buddha*, 295.
[3] *Sutta-Nipata.*
[4] Oldenburg's, *Dhamapada*, 411.

perfection than was his lot in this world, and which something may finally reach Nirvana.

Is there aught in this marvellous web of human ideas—in which the warp is purest egotism and the woof a strange self-denial—which approaches the law of Christ? Love thy God and love thy neighbor as thyself has commanded the Saviour of the world. Love thyself to the exclusion of all else—for all else will bring pain and suffering into thy life—declares he who has been pointed out as a prototype of Jesus Christ, and whose code of laws has been declared to be the source of the divine precept of Christian love. Buddhism, which teaches that all in this world is delusion, producing pain and sorrow and misery, that there is no hope, no light, no actual substantial happiness even hereafter, but that surcease of sorrow is only in non-existence, leads not upward. If, therefore, there are those that maintain that Buddha is the "Light of Asia," that he has led countless numbers to the light, they but demonstrate their own blindness, and that they, in reality, see no light who have ceased to see in Him who declared to a suffering world that He is the way, the Truth and the Life, the Light which shines for all the world.

J. S. Geisler.

Scientific Chronicle.

A MAGNO-MICROSCOPE.

It appears that we are on the eve of a revolution in dioptrics. What we have long been accustomed to designate as the "wonders of the microscope" will be dwarfed into very pigmy marvels indeed. It is stated that Prof. Gates, of Washington, has worked out a process by which objects can be magnified to a size three hundred times greater than by any microscope now in use. The process is one by which the magnified object projected on a lens can be magnified by a second, as if the reflection were a real object. Prof. Gates says that the power of the instrument is three million diameters.

If this discovery fulfils all that is claimed for it, it will deserve to be ranked as an original discovery in dioptrical science, and the discoverer will be more fortunate than he or those who invented the original simple microscope, for the honor of which there is a scramble between the partisans of Malpighi, Lieberkühn, Hooke, Ellis, Swam-Werdam, Lyonnet, and several other scientific men. Sir David Brewster made the important discovery of the superiority of ground gems, such as diamond, sapphire and garnet, to the ordinary glass magnifiers previously in use. The garnet lenses were found the best of these, as they show no trace of the double refraction tendency inseparable from the sapphire and the diamond. Dr. Wollaston, who discovered the system of compound lenses, made the first great advance in the direction now claimed by Prof. Gates; but his improvement appears to have been rather the result of chance discovery than mathematical cogitation. Mr. Tolles, of Boston, deserves credit for the invention of a decided improvement, much in the direction of Mr. Gates's discovery, an achromatic concave contrivance called an amplifier, which is introduced into the body of the instrument. But Prof. Gates's method, if his expectations be realized, must upset the conclusions of many eminent men regarding the limits of microscopic vision and segregation. It ought to be an invaluable help in determining the real nature and source of the light obtained from the famous Crookes tubes.

It is not very surprising to find that ancient civilization was acquainted with the principle of the microscope. Mr. Layard found a rude one in his Nineveh explorations amid the ruins of the palace of Nimrud. The apparatus was fashioned from a piece of rock-crystal. In Athens magnifying glasses were common articles of commerce as far back as the days of Aristophanes, and we may be certain that Archimedes devoted much attention to their scientific properties when he proposed to utilize his "burning-glasses," as the legend goes, to the destruction of hostile

fleets. The author of "Quo Vadis" recalls the fact that the tyrant Nero was in the habit of using one of these magnifiers, an immense cut emerald, for the purpose of scrutinizing faces at a distance. It was not good for any one to be the object of his scientific scrutiny, for the magnifying power was directed toward the discovery of the faults, and not the virtues, of the person, for he was no less an adept in the use of poisons than in the proper construction of Latin poetry—a pagan Admirable Crichton with a diabolical turn in all his versatile accomplishments.

TREBLING THE SPEED OF RAILWAY TRAVEL.

The possibility of attaining enormous speed on electric railroads is discussed in the "Engineering Magazine" for October by Messrs. Charles H. Davis and F. Stuart Williamson. What is proposed is undoubtedly startling, yet the reasons advanced seem to bring the theory within the domain of feasibility, bearing in mind the fact that electric power is an agency whose force is limited only by the capabilities of the instruments to which it is applied. A train running at a speed of 170 miles an hour is what is contemplated, so as to cover the distance between New York harbor and Philadelphia in a little over 36 minutes. Astonishing as the proposition is, when the mathematical details on which it is based are examined there appears nothing visionary about it. The problem is worked out very carefully, and all the topographic groundwork is taken from minute maps made from governmental surveys.

Restricted entirely to passenger traffic, it is proposed to have the cars built so as to carry 140 passengers each, and driven by 6 wheels of 7 feet diameter. The front and rear cars would be provided with a sloping hood or bonnet, so as to reduce the atmospheric resistance, so that the train complete would appear somewhat like an elongated torpedo. Each car would weigh about 150 tons. Power would be supplied from five central stations along the proposed route. To effect the end in view, it would be necessary to have power supplied by a "third rail," lying close to the side of the cars, and therefore elevated a couple of feet above the ordinary track—this rail to be of steel, and supplied with a current from the feeder system running between the tracks. Such a plan is already in operation on the Brooklyn Bridge, and there is no reason to believe it would not work equally well on a longer system. The greatest difficulties to be overcome lie in the attainment of a perfect signalling system, but the proposers do not seem to think they are by any means insuperable. Rear-end collisions would be the only ones to be guarded against, and the automatic arrangements for the prevention of such contingencies should be, of course, such as could be perfectly relied on. The question of the great speed proposed being attainable without inconvenience to passengers is gone into carefully, and decided in the affirmative. All the engineering problems in connection with the project are discussed down to the smallest detail, and

the conclusion arrived at is that the construction and operation of such a line of railway is feasible. The question of cost, working expenses and probable receipts is held over for a succeeding paper.

THE LIMITATIONS OF CARRIER-PIGEONS.

With the fate of Professor Andrée and his Arctic balloon is bound up the solution of the question of the powers of carrier-pigeons. The audacious aeronaut took with him twenty-five of these interesting birds, and only one came back. This bird was liberated in lat. 82°. The others were to have been liberated, according to Andrée's programme, day after day. An English naturalist, Mr. Tegetmeier, gives it as his opinion that carrier-pigeons are not able to traverse the great distance that in less than one day would separate the travellers from the home of the pigeons, and still less to traverse the 870 miles between Tromsoe and the North Pole. Pigeons have flown from Belgium to Rome (less than 900 miles), but the proportion of those that made the journey was very small; besides, the flight took fifteen days; and, finally, it was made under favorable conditions, in that, wherever a pigeon might alight, he found food and a resting-place. These conditions are absolutely lacking in the Arctic regions, and the probability is that the pigeons of the expedition have perished miserably and uselessly.

THE GENERATION OF AIR-WAVES.

Professor S. P. Thompson, who has devoted great attention to the study of physics, some time ago exhibited before the Royal Society in London, and other scientific institutions, a model designed to illustrate mechanically his theory of the mode of propagation of transverse air-waves. This apparatus he now describes in an article in the "Electrical Engineer."

The apparatus is mounted on a strong wooden frame, about two metres long. At one end is the "oscillator," a heavy mass of brass hung by two strong V-cords from arms which project parallel to the longer dimension of the frame. This mass can be set swinging in a transverse direction by a suitable impulse given by hand. At the other end of the frame is the "resonator," a circle of brass wire hung by a tri-filar suspension. Oscillator and resonator must be adjusted by shortening or lengthening the cords so as to have identical periods of oscillation.

The real problem in the construction of the apparatus was to find a mechanical means of transmitting the energy of the oscillator in visible waves to the resonator. The means finally adopted was a series of inter-connected pendulums on a plan somewhat similar to one suggested in 1877 by Professor Osborne Reynolds. Instead of using springs, however, the requisite inter-connection is obtained by simply suspending the leaden bullets which act as pendulum-bobs by V-suspensions which overlap, and which are tied together at a point about 4 centi-

metres above each of the balls. No ball can be laterally displaced without tending to drag its neighbor also, so that a shearing stress is transmitted along the line of balls.

The waves in the model travel quite slowly, and there is a fascination in watching their progress along the row of balls until they arrive at the resonator and set it into responsive vibration. A row of inter-connected pendulums such as this affords a means of illustrating many points in physics. A piece of netting, hung on hooks from a horizontal rail, and ending below in a short fringe, with leaden beads on the fringe tips, will also serve to illustrate the propagation of a transverse wave. The structure adopted absolutely refuses to transmit longitudinal disturbances, there being no compressional elasticity between the balls to propagate a longitudinal wave.

PHOTOGRAPHING THE WHOLE STARRY FIRMAMENT.

In "Popular Science News" (September) Mary Proctor tells of efforts to make a complete celestial survey by its means. The author's father, Richard A. Proctor, the astronomer, was the first to prepare in a single chart a map of all stars that could be seen in the northern heavens with a telescope 2½ inches in diameter, and after completing the work he suggested extending the survey to greater and greater depths. Says Miss Proctor:

"A photographic survey is now being made of the heavens, in both the Northern and Southern hemispheres, of stars down to the eleventh magnitude, while another set of plates is being prepared showing stars down to the fourteenth magnitude. . . . .

"The tedious work of charting the stars has been replaced by the simple method of placing a photographic plate in the telescope, which does the recording work perfectly and exactly. The highly-sensitive photographic plate records impressions from even the faintest stars if the exposure be long enough to allow the feeble light-rays to work on the delicate film. In this way stars are revealed that the human eye can never see. There seems to be no limit to the faintness of the stars that can be photographed with a good instrument, smaller and smaller stars revealing themselves the longer the time of exposure.

"Realizing how marvellous and powerful a weapon of astronomical research photography has become, a selection of photographs of stars, star-clusters and nebulæ, by Dr. Isaac Roberts, is being published in "Knowledge," a magazine founded by my father in the year 1881. . . . .

"'When these photographs are examined,' writes Dr. Roberts, 'it will be seen that the stars on several parts of each plate are grouped into semicircles, segments, portions of ellipses, and into lines of various degrees of curvature. Some of the groups are constituted of bright stars of nearly equal magnitude; some are of faint stars, also of nearly equal magnitude; some are of both bright and faint stars, and there is much regularity in the spacing distances between the stars in the several

groups. Photographs showing curves and combinations of stars have been taken by the Brothers Henry in Paris, by Dr. Gill at the Cape, by M. Russell at Sydney, by Mr. Max Wolf at Heidelberg, by Von Gothard in Hungary, by Professor Pickering and Professor Barnard in America, and by others in various parts of the world, and they all confirm the reality of stellar groupings in the part of the sky to which they refer.' "

THE HEIGHT OF CLOUDS.

The much-discussed problem of the height of clouds is again occupying scientific men. The search-light ought to be extremely serviceable in this inquiry, and many years ago the feasibility of so using it was suggested by Professor Cleveland Abbe. Considering the adaptability of this luminous measuring-rule to every form of distance-determination, by reason of the facilities for fixing its processes, it is somewhat astonishing that it has been so long neglected. Professor Abbe returned to the subject lately in the " Weather Review." He pointed out the greatly-increased facilities which modern improvements in the search-light afford for the pursuit of accurate investigation. Thus, in harbors on the sea-coast, where one wishes to ascertain the presence and development of low-lying fogs, the search-light which renders them visible is an invaluable assistant. A year ago some accounts were published relative to the cloud-effects on Mount Low and at Pasadena. According to these accounts, Mount Low is about fifteen miles north-northeast from Los Angeles, and about six miles in a straight line from Pasadena. When the beam of light fell upon the bodies of clouds they at once became luminous, so that all the details of motion were visible; when the beam fell upon the falling rain, the great cone of light glowed like molten metal. It seems, concludes Prof. Abbe, that the formation and motion of fog and cloud at night-time could be advantageously studied by means of the search-light. The height at which fog first forms and its gradual extension upward and downward during the night would be a very interesting and profitable investigation. Some time ago we were amused at speculations on the commercial uses to which the principle of the search-light might be applied. Clouds were to be utilized for the display of advertisements, for instance, and some daring minds even dreamed of our being able to communicate with the inhabitants of other planets—if any such there be—by some development of this useful agency. All these roseate dreams have for the present faded out of memory, or been found impracticable on test-experiments. But as this is the age when the seemingly wildest visions of the scientific enthusiast are being daily realized, we need not conclude that the project of cloud-language is by any means an abandoned chimera.

RECLAMATION OF SWAMPS.

The State Geologist of New Jersey, Mr. Smock, lately made a visit to Holland to see how that wonderful little country has coped with

problems similar to those presented by the New Jersey swamps, and the State Engineer has made a report on the whole matter. From a notice of this report in the "Scientific American" we take the following extracts:

"It is stated that of the two systems of reclamation, filling and diking, the latter is the better, and, indeed, the only one feasible in this case. It is stated that, even if these marshes are filled up for city purposes, pumping will still have to be resorted to, as there will not be sufficient fall to sewer and drain the district by gravity. Filling to the extent of six feet will cost an average of $2500 per acre. The area can be embanked and pumping-works installed for about $1,000,000, or less than $40 per acre. . . . .

"It is recommended that at first only the embankments and main ditches and pumping-plants should be constructed, the whole area being laid out in twenty-acre farms and sold as promptly as possible, on the express condition that they should be immediately and thoroughly ditched and brought under cultivation. It is urged that the prompt improvement of each plot should be considered more important than the purchase-price. As soon as sanitary conditions have been brought about, the improvement of water-front and business and manufacturing sites could be carried out as fast as they could be sold, the proceeds paying for the improvements.

"The interest charges and operating expenses are estimated at $6 to $7 per acre, and it is predicted that in a few years this charge could be entirely covered by assessments on the property itself, any deficiencies in the interim being met by the surrounding districts that are benefited by the undertaking."

The present state of the marshes is thus set forth by Mr. Vermuele, the State Engineer:

"Underlying the 27,000 acres of marsh is a mass of alluvium mixed with peat, wood and other vegetable matter, more or less decayed. The depth of this accumulation ranges generally from seven to fifteen feet. The natural level of the surface is three or four inches above mean high tide, but the whole is frequently overflowed, and such extreme tides as that of the second week of last November cover it to an average depth of eighteen inches. Lately an unhealthy and undesirable population is beginning to be crowded upon them. Twelve lines of railroad cross the marshes, six of them trunk lines, and the impression made is unprepossessing. . . . .

"The objections to the meadows on the ground of their intrinsic ugliness, however, is the least serious that can be raised, for their existence has always been a menace to the health of the surrounding districts, and in the summer months they form a prolific breeding-ground for the hordes of mosquitoes that render life burdensome in the many picturesque and otherwise desirable suburbs of Jersey City."

The "Scientific American" comments on the report as follows:

"If the estimates of the report are not too sanguine, the whole scheme should meet with hearty approval. The substitution of over

forty square miles of good land for a dismal and malodorous swamp in the midst of a district whose taxable value is $3,000,000,000 is a proposition that should commend itself strongly to the authorities and property-owners who are immediately affected, and indirectly to the State at large."

WILD INDIAN CORN.

On the much-debated question whether or not Indian corn grows in a wild state on this continent, Mr. R. P. Harris wrote some time ago, in "Garden and Forest":

"That such a corn has been found in several regions of this continent, naturally reproducing itself, and that it has a character of growth that fits it for long preservation in a dry climate, although, if planted and cultivated for a few years, all the characteristics of wildness gradually disappear. The cobs of wild maize are thin and hard, covered with lines of mushroom-shaped elevations, each having a wire-like pedicle growing from the top, attached to a glume enclosing a small pointed grain, or a flat grain, smaller than any pop-corn. These kernel husks overlap each other toward the point of the ear, like the shingles on the roof of a house. The imbrications are largest and longest at the butt of the ear, and gradually become less pronounced as they advance in distinct rows to the point. The individual glumes are from an inch to two inches long, and are much longer than this where the grains are not fertilized, particularly if the entire ear is of this character, as is proved by a specimen in my collection. Over these imbrications is the outside husk as we have it in all cultivated corns." Mr. Harris further says that Indian corn in its wild state has been found in Arizona, southern Texas, the valley of Mexico, and Central America. He has known Rocky Mountain corn a long period of time; it has very small ears. One of the professors of the University of Mexico has been experimenting with the wild corn of the valley, and has the engraving of a plant that grew to be about five feet high. Wild corn has also been grown by the Landreths, near Philadelphia, to whom it was sent from Arizona. Some found by Dr. Williams, of Houston, Tex., is a white flint of large size; but fifteen stalks produced only four ears, which grew on two of the stalks. The plant is a very vigorous grower, but it is not productive, and eight stalks grown in Texas did not bear a single ear.

We do not see any force in the objections to the belief in wild Indian corn. It has been pretty well demonstrated that a good many of the present European cereals grew in very early times in a wild state along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

THE BICYCLE AS A DISEASE-DEVELOPER.

An eminent English physician, Dr. Shadwell, has given some experiences of his in regard to bicycle maladies, in an article in the "National Review." He says, amongst other things:

"Here is a case. A girl, healthy, rather stronger than the average, able to take her part with the rest in other things, learns to cycle. She rides with her friends, and rather enjoys it. To all appearances she can do as much as anybody in short flights. One day they go farther, nothing much, perhaps ten miles; the result, utter collapse, with bed for several days. And the same thing happens whenever she ventures beyond the merest potter. Her friends, no stronger, no more experienced, are not affected in the same way at all. She 'overtaxed her strength.' Of course she did; but she did not know she was doing it, and had no reason to suppose it. That was just the mischief. Sometimes the consequences are much more serious. In one case within my knowledge a girl developed exophthalmic goitre as the result of a rather long ride, which she supposed herself able to accomplish without difficulty. Her throat swelled at the time, never went down, and quickly developed into a well-marked case. This obscure but serious affection is said to be chiefly caused by 'mental excitement.' Another form of organic injury that I have come across is internal inflammation, of which the symptoms are much pain and a kind of chronic dysentery, extremely obstinate and of the most lowering character. 'The after-effects of cycling,' says an experienced rider and one accustomed to far more violent forms of exercise, 'are quite different from those of any other outdoor exercise with which I am acquainted, and less pleasant. Even a short ride leaves me with a pallid face, a palpitating heart, the beginnings of a headache, and a tendency to insomnia.' Another speaks of the 'peculiar form of nervous exhaustion,' and 'that strained feeling which led to insomnia and headache.' A third, the 'holder of many cups won on the running-path and river,' declares himself 'quite unable to cycle, as even a short run on a machine at the easiest of paces gives me a severe headache.' . . . . Now I submit that the theory of over-exertion is quite inadequate to explain the kind of effects here described. To my mind they point distinctly to a cerebral, and not to a muscular origin."

EXPERIMENTS IN "COLD LIGHTING."

In an article under the above heading "The Sanitary Plumber" tells us that the present methods of illumination are to be superseded, not by improved incandescent or arc lamps, not by glow-tubes, like those of Tesla or Moore, nor even by Edison's lamp in which the Roentgen rays fall on a phosphorescent substance and cause it to glow—although this last comes nearer than any of the others to the coming system. The "light of the future" is practically a Crookes tube containing phosphorescent material, which is made to give out light by allowing the cathode rays to fall directly upon it.

Interesting experiments, according to the European press, are now being made by the Austrian physician Puluj, whose researches and discoveries in the domain of what is known as "cold light" have given him prominence and standing in the scientific world. Fifteen years ago he invented a so-called phosphorescent lamp. It excited little comment

at the time, as it was thought to be but an imitation of the tubes of Geissler or Crookes. But in the light of modern ether discoveries it has taken on importance. It generates not only intense Roentgen rays, but it also transforms nearly all of the energy of the electric current into light. It emits an intense greenish-white light in sufficient quantity to "illuminate a small room." Professor Ebert has made measurements which show that a single horse-power of electric energy would be sufficient to operate 46,000 Puluj lamps.

Professor Lodge, who is the head of the department of experimental physics in Universal College, Liverpool, says that "if mechanical energy can be converted entirely into light alone, one man turning the crank of a suitable machine could generate enough light for a whole city." Puluj claims that his lamp fulfils this condition, and he is working hard to bring it down to a practical basis.

THE CHINESE CLOCK SYSTEM WINNING.

The West is taking one more idea from the Celestial Empire. We believe it was from the Chinese we got our notions of a banking system; possibly, too, our notions of printing from blocks was brought from the same quarter. Now the Chinese method of division of the day seems likely to supersede our less perfect one. On all the Belgian railroads the twenty-four-hour clock is now in use for the timing of the traffic, and the system is hailed as an improvement. In Italy the system has been for some time on trial, and the results are said to be satisfactory. Switzerland and Germany seem disposed to take it up, and we may expect in a short time to find it in operation all over Europe, except in Russia, where the obstinacy of the government will not allow the change from the old calendar to the Gregorian. Some grumbles against the new clock have been heard. One correspondent complains that the inversion of the usual order of hours and minutes in the time-tables (which is one feature of the new arrangement) leads to desperate confusion. He puts the case this way:

"Suppose you intend to take the Cologne express. You look through the time-tables, and find that it leaves at 23.26. How are you to know that this means 11.26 P.M.? Again, you board the 5.40 A.M. train at Cologne, and are horrified to discover that it reaches Brussels at 21.29—in reality 9.29 P.M. Surely the current division of time in half days of twelve hours each is much more satisfactory."

The "Frankfurter Zeitung" regards these complaints as foolish, and says:

"It is not at all difficult to get familiar with it. From 0 to 12 indicates the hours before noon; substract 12 from every higher number, and you have the afternoon time according to the prevalent system. Surely this is simple enough. There is no doubt that the old style is responsible for many mistakes in railroad travelling. The reform, therefore, should be welcomed by all friends of progress in the system of international transportation."

SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF NOXIOUS REPTILES.

How many ignorant and impatient people are to be found declaiming against the Eternal Wisdom on account of some petty annoyance from the small things of the air or the field—flies or house-pests, and the like—wondering why such things were ever created, and otherwise proving their own superior judgment. Yet the further we advance in knowledge the more proof do we daily find of the truth of Pope's dictum:

> "All Nature is but art, unknown to thee:
> All chance, direction—which thou canst not see."

Not long ago it was announced that a French priest in the far East had found that a cure for cancer was to be found in the secretions under the skin of the toad and certain species of lizards. Now we have another instance of the usefulness of more venomous members of the saurian family.

Experiments with the bile of the African cobra, the puff adder, and the rattlesnake, it was stated at a meeting of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, showed that the bile, when mixed with the venom of serpents, was able to prevent lethal doses of the latter from producing death. Although non-toxic in the alimentary canal, the bile salts and pigments acted as poisons when injected under the skin or into a blood-vessel. It was improbable that bile in its natural form could be used as an antidote except by internal administration or by application to the wound caused by a snake-bite. To the United States Marine Hospital Service the report on these experiments has been forwarded, with a view of testing their value.

DANGER IN THE TURKISH BATH.

So many advantages are presented by the ever-agreeable Turkish bath that we are apt to overlook the danger that may lurk in the indulgence of one if our physical condition or the aërostatic state of the bath itself be, for the time being, unsuitable. Cases of death in the bath have sometimes been heard of, and, as a word of precaution, a recent issue of the "Hospital" (London) remarked:

"The essential peculiarity of the Turkish, as distinct from all other forms of baths, is the very much higher temperature to which the bather is subjected. In the hottest room the temperature may be from 250° to 300° F.; that is, about the temperature at which an oven is kept for the baking of puff pastry, and considerably higher than is required for ordinary cakes or for baking meat. Under these circumstances, the safety of the bather depends on two things—his power of perspiring and the power possessed by the air in the bath of evaporating his perspiration. To take the latter first, it must never be forgotten that the Turkish bath is not a vapor bath. It is a hot-air bath, and the life of the bather depends on the air remaining far from saturated with watery vapor. If, in consequence of any deficiency of ventilation, this hot air

were to become saturated with moisture, evaporation from the bather's skin would cease, and he would be steamed alive. His safety depends absolutely and entirely on evaporation from the surface of the skin and the bronchial mucous membrane. This being so, it is obvious that the bather will suffer distress, and, in fact, be affected with partial heat-stroke, even when the ventilation is good, if his own capacity for perspiration is diminished."

EXPLOSIVE SHELLS OF NATURAL MANUFACTURE.

It is a well-known fact that many kinds of deep-sea fish brought up from the lower depths of the ocean explode when near the surface through want of lung power to resist the unusual quantities of oxygen with which they are brought into contact. But of shell-fish that explode without any such cause, we do not remember any previous mention.

"Walking along the beach on Mobile Bay recently," says "The National Druggist," "a young lady picked up a handful of little shells, left by the tide, and among them several shells of a small marine 'snail,' the largest of which was probably a half-inch in diameter and the smallest some three-eighths inch. She dropped them into her pocket and forgot all about them until several days afterward, when an unpleasant odor in her wardrobe attracted her attention to them. On taking them out of the pocket some fell on the floor, and in recovering them she placed her foot on one. The act was followed by an explosion, quite sharp, and loud enough to be heard all over the floor on which her room is. Astonished, she concluded to try another, and the same result followed. On examination, it was found the mouth of each shell was firmly closed by a membrane of greater or less thickness, formed by the drying of the animal slime. This had probably occurred soon after removal from the moisture of the beach, and the little inhabitant of the shell dying, the gases of decomposition had quite filled its internal space. On exerting a little pressure by squeezing the shell between two blocks of wood, quite a loud explosion was produced, the fragments of the shell being thrown several feet. Subsequently, on trying the experiment, out of a dozen shells only two failed to explode."

SCIENTIFIC JOTTINGS.

"Paris barbers and hairdressers are now obliged, in accordance with police regulations, to employ sanitary measures in carrying on their business," says "The Medical News." "They are required to use only nickel-plated combs, to substitute pulverizers for powder-puffs, to cover the hair cut off with sawdust and have it promptly removed, and to place all metal instruments, razors, shears, combs, clippers, etc., in a sterilizer for ten minutes before they are used."

"It has been found by M. J. Puluj," says "The Electrical World,"

"that substances which fluoresce most brightly under the visible cathode rays give off the greatest amount of Roentgen radiation. M. Puluj believes that Roentgen ether-waves originate in the bombardment by negatively charged molecules from the cathode, and in the abrupt loss of charge in these. He finds that these Roentgen ether-waves may cause fluorescence of calcium sulphid, but believes that invisible as well as visible radiation emanate from a screen of this substance. M. Puluj states that vacuum-tubes of all kinds glow when subjected to the action of Roentgen rays."

"A LARGE Dussand microphonograph, now being constructed for the Paris Exhibition of 1900, is expected to make the voice heard by 10,000 people," says "The Electrical Review." "This form of apparatus is especially designed for the deaf, and for the study of the feeble sounds given out by the organs of the body in health and disease. It magnifies the voice much as a lens magnifies objects to the eye. The register is a modified phonograph, with a diaphragm vibrated by small electro-magnets, receiving currents through a microphone; the repeater is somewhat similar, with a microphone attached to the membrane, the current for this being obtained from one to sixty battery-cells and thence passing to a telephone. The intensity depends upon the amount of current passing. The instrument is being used in the education of deaf-mutes, and has had a marked effect in stimulating the nerves and apparatus of hearing."

ACCORDING to "L'Echo des Mines," Paris, bullets of paper covered with aluminum are the latest thing in ammunition. "This invention, made by a French officer, tends to do away with the seriousness of wounds made by lead balls, or those with steel coverings, owing to the rupture of the bony parts. According to the patent granted to Richard Luders of Gorlitz, the precision of fire is in nowise affected, but the passage made by the projectiles through the body is absolutely straight and permits of a rapid closing of the wound."

"ACCORDING to the doctrine of permutations," says "Electricity," "there is a necessary limit to the possible number of arrangements of any given number of units, symbols, words, etc., the logical conclusions being that the time will come when it will be impossible for a composer to make a new tune, for the author to write a new story, or for the physicist to perform a new experiment or obtain a new result. Mr. Fournier D'Albe, according to "The Electrician" (London), has figured out by this means that the total possible number of physical experiments is 3,200. Of these about 2,000 have already been performed, leaving only about 1,200 more to complete the history of physical science. This is scarcely enough to go around, and those who would participate in putting on the finishing touches to science should bestir themselves. Mr. D'Albe, however, probably did not consider how vastly the number of permutations would be increased by the addition of a single element.

Book Notices.

SOCIALISM AND CATHOLICISM, from the Italian of Count Edward Soderini. By *Richard Jennery-Shee.* Longmans, Green & Co. 1896. Pp. x., 343.

It is easy to formulate the Social Question in terms of political science, but through the high-sounding phrase the practical mind discerns the ultimate problem—the stomach question, "How to get on table, if possible, meat—or at least vegetables—at some hour of the day for all of us"—on this clear necessity turns the entire business of the world, as Mr. Ruskin expressed it long ago; and this, at bottom, is *the* social question. The stern fact is more and more deepening into the general consciousness—one might even say conscience—that for thousands of human beings the question is quite insoluble.

That there are multitudes of men and women, especially in our large cities, able and willing to work, who can find no visible means of support, and that of the vast army of toilers a large percentage are insufficiently clad and housed—this has become, and still more and more becomes, an abiding phenomenon of our present social status. And yet, in view of the unfailing bounty of Mother Earth, it is passing strange, at least on first inspection, or when the question is presented in its general terms, that such a problem should at all exist. Yet exist it does, and sooner or later a solution must be found and applied, or the inevitable forces of anarchism will cut the Gordian knot and solve the question by destroying at once the causes, the conditions and the environment which have made such a problem possible and given it birth.

One extreme solution of the difficulty—extreme, yet not extremest, since it falls short of anarchism—has been and is offered by socialism, viz., the abolition of the cause of the existing evil—private capital—and the substitution of collective ownership. "The economic quintessence of the socialistic program, the real aim of the international movement, is as follows: To replace the system of private capital (*i.e.*, the speculative method of production, regulated on behalf of society only by the free competition of private enterprises) by a system of collective capital, that is, by a method of production which would introduce a unified (social or 'collective') organization of national labor, on the basis of *collective* or common *ownership* of the *means of production* by all the members of the society. This collective method of production would remove the present competitive system by placing under official administration such departments of production as can be managed collectively (socially or corporatively), as well as the distribution among all of the common produce of all, according to the amount and social utility of the productive labor of each. This represents, says Dr. Schäffle, in the shortest possible formula, the aim of the socialism of to-day, however variously expressed, and in some cases obscurely conceived, may be the proposed methods for attaining it."[1]

To tell the story of this theory and method, especially in its more re-

[1] *Quintessence of Socialism*, ci.

cent and so-called scientific form, as devised and advocated by Lasalle and Karl Marx, to show the inadequacy of the system as a solution of the social question, to point to some remedies, and to exhibit the principles and general method by which alone the existing social and economical difficulties can be met—these are the central objects of Count Soderini's work, an English translation of which is here at hand.

The account and refutation of socialistic theories are clear and philosophical. General socialism is an old method of meeting social evils, and has always proved ineffectual because of its advocating extreme measures that conflict with the individual nature of man. On the other hand it contains, especially in its modern scientific form, a certain measure of truth, and a right theory must enucleate the sounder elements and discard the false and worthless. But here comes in the real difficulty—that which calls for great breadth and depth of vision on the part of the social philosopher—viz., the discernment of the province of State intervention, the fixing of the limits between individualism on the one hand and governmental interference and legislation on the other, in matters economical and industrial. It is at this uncertain boundary, of course, that theorists and theories diverge, one claiming a larger liberty for the man, another a restriction of that liberty and a correspondingly larger intervention on the part of the State. The true and just theory here, as elsewhere, lies in the golden mean. The determination of that mean depends on a sound psychology and a proportionately firm ethics—individual and social. After analyzing the subject, Count Soderini establishes his point of view in the oft-quoted analogy of the parental state. "To sum up the whole in one thought," he says, "we hold that the State should be likened to an earnest-minded father of a family whose sons, being of age, that is, knowing how to reason for themselves, require only a guide to direct, in certain cases, their reasoning power. Hereby our severance seems to be well-marked off from the socialists, who desire the State to be like a father of a family, but an absolute and tyrannical parent, whose sons are declared incapable *a priori* of attaining to the age of reasoning" (p. 236).

From this standpoint the author proceeds to enumerate some spheres of State intervention wherefrom "remedies" would be likely to emanate. Amongst these are found legal recognition of labor associations—the Sunday rest—the normal day's work—woman and child labor—guilds—courts of arbitration and conciliation—boards and labor committees—prevention of dishonest speculation—savings banks—assurance societies—profit-sharing—credit institutes, etc. On these and many other points the author presents suggestions, wise and hopeful. But neither in these, any more than in socialism, lies the true—true because complete—answer to the social question. Back of them all, and informing each, must be the vivifying influence of religion—in a "return to Christianity" alone is there hope for society. It is in the emphasizing of this radical remedy, in the exposition of its true inwardness, in the demonstration of its efficacy by appeal to facts, past and present, as well as to the highest authority in political and economic science, that the chief merit of Count Soderini's work consists. It is partly from an aversion to the restraints which religion puts on human passions, partly from a false or defective philosophy of society and economics, that socialists refuse to recognize Christianity as the root solvent of social ills. On the other hand, it is the broad and incisive vision of writers such as Count Soderini that enables these to discern the necessity of supernatural influences, in order to perfect and render possible the thorough application of merely natural remedies. The ways in which Christianity is

felt in the evolution and control of the forces intrinsic to society are eloquently defended by our author. Christianity, he says, "far from interposing obstacles to the development of public well-being, to the perfecting of knowledge, to the discoveries of science and the rational comforts of life, helps forward, and even blesses, every one of those things as such, by rendering it a matter of strict duty to respect the property of others, and by enjoining as an inviolable and universal law the love of labor and the necessity of good order. Christianity lends itself nobly to the splendor of the arts, to the magnificence of cities, to the spirit of association, to the advancement of industry and of agriculture, and, furthermore, to the production of wealth.

"It superadds, however, the necessity to control, in conformity with reason, all the appetites; to regulate the employment of wealth and restrain indulgence in comforts. It recommends whatever may render labor more profitable, economy more useful, the relations amongst men steadfastly peaceful and brotherly, and ourselves more energetic in the employment of our working powers. It desires, in addition, that wealth and well-being should be better apportioned, not only by means of justice and charity, but also through labor and foresight; that the several social bonds be held in respect, the rights of conscience and human liberty be kept inviolable, all legitimate authority acknowledged and obeyed; that each one in the measure within his sphere should help to advance the welfare of others by quickening himself to that charity which soothes the miseries of some, puts a curb on the selfishness of others, and strengthens the basis of true brotherly love in the name of God" (p. 312).

The passage reads like an extract from the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII. And well it may, for the main object of Count Soderini's work is to develop the letter and interpret the spirit of that memorable pronouncement. Propositions of the kind will, of course, to many have little meaning, and will be passed by as a vague theory whose generalities are too remote from realization to deserve patient study. Yet none the less they outline the one radical solution of the social question. It is well they have found so clear, forcible and practical an expositor as Count Soderini. One could wish that the translator had given himself greater freedom from the stiffness of foreign idioms. On the whole, however, the style is translucent, and the English-reading public may well be grateful for this version, even though it be not perfect, of so solid and interesting a contribution to the literature of social and economic science.

THEOLOGIA FUNDAMENTALIS. Auctore *Ign. Ottiger, S.J.* Tom. I. De Revelatione Supernat. Friburgi: Herder (St. Louis, Mo.). 1897. Pp. xxiv., 928. Price, $4.

Fundamental theology is defined by Fr. Ottiger as the "scientific defense and demonstration of the Christian-Catholic Church," and from another point of view, "the science which treats thoroughly (*erudite*) of the constitutive and directive principle of the various theological disciplines." It has, therefore, a double function to perform—first, to furnish a systematic apology and demonstration of the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion and its teacher, the Catholic Church; secondly, to lay a solidly scientific basis for special dogmatics. Taken in the rigid sense thus formulated, this department of theological study is comparatively recent, and of all its cognate branches

is the one in which progressive development of matter and method is most apparent.

Though the defenses of Christian faith directed against Jew and Pagan by the apologists of the early centuries, as well as the kindred writings of mediæval times against Islamism and the apologies refutatory of the beginnings of Protestantism, fall within the general scope of fundamental theology, still the science in its present limits and methods can hardly be said to antedate the opening decades of the last century, when the assaults of Deism against the possibility, necessity and knowability of revelation, and the authenticity and veracity of the Sacred Scriptures, aroused Catholic apologists to a systematic defense of the foundations and channels of revealed truth. Ever since that day the army of trained defenders of the faith has been on the increase. No period, however, in the life of this science has been so productive in efficient work as the past and present decades. The works of a popular character on the subject that have recently appeared in German, French, Italian, and last, because least, in English, added to the more didactic expositions in Latin, would, if gathered together, make quite a library. He would take but a superficial view of the scope and importance of this branch of knowledge, and would be ill-acquainted with the varying demands made upon the Christian apologists by the changing modes and phases of the intellectual life of the times, who would question the utility of this theological productiveness. It does not concern us, therefore, here and now to set up an apoplogy for Apologetics. Suffice it to call attention to one of the most thorough contributions to the recent literature of the subject, and to point to the main features which merit for it the recognition of earnest students, especially of those who have completed an ordinary course of theology, or who are engaged in teaching either the science itself, as such, or the various parts of its subject—for the work appeals mainly to the well advanced.

Fr. Ottiger is conscious that, though much has been done by scholars in recent times to bring Apologetics nearer towards ideal perfection, there still remains room for further improvement. The lines on which he himself modestly strives in that direction are, first, towards a rigidly scientific method. This is manifest principally in his recision of subjects not falling strictly within the province of his science, such, viz., as are handled thoroughly either in philosophy, in special dogmatics, or in exegesis. Secondly, in a more exact and thorough development of the *Status Quæstionis* introductory to the central theses. This element has called for an almost entirely new treatment of a number of subjects, such, for instance, as the necessity of a supernatural revelation and the visibility of the Church. Another point of excellence is the full and closely-woven tissue of positive demonstration, and, on the other hand, the careful attention bestowed upon the statement and refutation of the objections urged by the opponents of religion at the present time. No pains, moreover, have been spared, the author assures us, in the verifications of passages from Patristic and other authorities, so that the student may feel safe not only that the citations are authentic, but that they have *per se* in the original sources the demonstrative value claimed for them in their present application, and that the excerpts have been made with no violence to the context whence they have been detached.

Much discussion has been going on during the past year or more in the French reviews regarding the most efficient method to be followed by Catholic apologists. Some writers are for discarding the older, traditional lines of defense and striving to win men to believe

by appealing to those harmonies of Christian faith which are more closely in touch with modern thought and tendencies. From this standpoint some would approach the *demonstratio Catholica* from the side of physical science, others from that of the comparative history of religions, others from the psychological and ethical requirements of human nature. This question of method is of course all-important. It is, however, too large a theme to be discussed just here. In passing, it may be observed that each and all of the new methods proposed are useful, and ought to be followed by writers of Christian apologies. Truth, whether natural or revealed, is many-sided, and they who would gain for it acceptance by the human mind may and should present it in lights the best calculated to manifest its claims and attractiveness. When, however, there is question of the structure of scientific Apologetics as such, no sounder or more logical method of defense and demonstration has yet been devised than that which starts from the idea and possibility of revelation, proves its necessity, its knowability, and the fact of its existence past and present. It adds no little to the student's confidence in the stability of these traditional lines of fundamental theology that so thoroughly equipped a scholar as Fr. Ottiger, after long experience and an all-around study of the subject under old and new lights, should base his present exhaustive work on the well-tried foundations of the past. A portion only, though a large one, of those foundations is laid in the present volume—that, namely, which concerns the theory (Sect. I.) and the fact (Sect. II.) of supernatural revelation.

Two more volumes are promised to complete the work. These will defend and demonstrate the theological doctrine on the Church of Christ, its institution, infallibility, etc. If they equal in matter and form the present volume, as doubtless they will, students of higher theology may justly feel proud of the splendid addition made to the literature of their science.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS DECALOGALIS ET SACRAMENTATIS. Auctore *P. Patritio Sporer, O.S.F.* Novis curis edidit P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, O.S.F. Tom. i., pp. ix., 878. Paderbornæ; Ex Typographia Bonifaciana, 1897.

Sporer was one of the great minds that illuminated the theological world and shed lustre on the family of St. Francis during the latter half of the seventeenth century. His work on the Decalogue and the Sacraments, which originally appeared in three volumes, is classified by so competent an authority as Lehmkuhl amongst the classics of its subject-matter. Pruner speaks of it as beyond praise, and finds the reason of its excellence in its admirable blending of the scholastic with the casuistic method—casuistic in the better sense of the term.

Clearness of presentation with practical application are merits which Scavini found in the work, whilst Hurter commends it for its solidity, erudition and perspicuity. It was one of the favorite authorities of St. Alphonsus, who speaks of the author as "in suis sententiis satis æquus," and, apparently in contrast with the rigorists of Sporer's time, "forte aliquando plus quam par est æquus." Probably one of the best commendations of the author is his deserving to rank in the same grade of theologians as his later brother in religion, Elbel. Few writers on moral theology possess the comprehensiveness, the firm grasp of detail, above all the perfect limpidity of style and felicity of illustration as Elbel. To say of any moralist that he is comparable to such an authority is no small encomium. It is, therefore, a happy idea that has prompted the editor of this new edition of Sporer to clothe the reprint in a

form identical with that in which he had previously presented the re-edited work of Elbel, thus typifying in its outer appearance the close inner resemblance of spirit and method of the two authors. Fr. Bierbaum has based the present edition on the text of the last edition published at Venice in 1756, collating with the latter the preceding Salisbury edition of 1692. The editorial work has consisted in verifying citations and in making such slight changes—designated by asterisks—as were required because of recent authoritative decrees of the Church. A second volume will complete the moral subjects connected with the Decalogue. A third on the Sacraments will terminate the work.

Prælectiones Dogmaticæ quas in Collegio Ditton-Hall. Habebat *Christianus Pesch, S.J.* Tom. iii. (De Sacr. Pœnit., Extr. Unctione, Ordine, Matrim.) Friburgi: Herder (St. Louis, Mo.). 1897. Pp. xiii., 432.

With the present volume Fr. Pesch brings his splendid series of volumes on "Dogmatic Theology" within one-fourth of completion. The fifth volume on Grace, pretermitted in the regular issue, is promised to appear next. An eighth volume, to be devoted to the Virtues, Sin, and *de Novissimis*, will bring the series to its close.

The present volume deals with subjects of the most deeply vital interest in the life of the Church and of individual souls—subjects in which the student of theology, including the clergy engaged in the practical exercise of the ministry, must needs be thoroughly grounded. The moral and devotional meaning and relations of the sacraments are based on the dogmatic teaching of the Church, and that teaching must be explained with all solidity and clarity if it is to fructify in practice. Solidity and clarity, it has been observed in our notices of the preceding volumes of the course, are the striking perfections of Fr. Pesch's prelections. The same remark holds good of the present volume.

The time has happily gone by when there is sufficient excuse for using an imperfectly-digested compendium as a text-book of dogma. The number of excellent *cursus*, such as the one at hand, recently published, give ample material from which the professor of theology may make easy selection. It would be well, however, if the author of so extended a course as this prepared a synopsis which could be made the basis of the technical work of the class-room. The student could then make more efficient use of the extended work for filling out by reading and reference the compendious information obtained from the digest. Such a synopsis can, of course, be made by professors, or even exceptionally good students; but, on the whole, an author is best qualified for abridging his own work. With such a compend the present course would be better adapted for use in our seminaries, where but little more than an hour a day can be given to the study of dogma.

Poems, with other selections from the writings of *Sister M. Genevieve Todd*, of the Sisters of Providence. Introduction by the *Rt. Rev. F. S. Chatard, D.D.*, Bishop of Vincennes. New York: P. J. Kennedy.

Sacred poetry, like sermon-writing, seems easy and attractive to the tyro, and only difficult to the finished artist. The *infinitus numerus* rushes in where the angel might fear to tread. And so it happens that a religious title to a poem is usually considered a sign-post frankly and conscientiously set up in the highways of literature to warn the multitude away. For, indeed, very little of such poetry has either artistic

delicacy or devotional inspiration to recommend it. But let not the angel fear to tread that sublime pathway—"we will run after thee to the odour of thy ointments!" The words with which the Rt. Rev. Bishop begins his Introduction have but anticipated and assured our own judgment. "'Charming, pure, fragrant as a lily' were the words that came as if spontaneously from our lips, as we finished reading the poems of Sister Mary Genevieve, a few days after she had passed to the bourne for which her soul had yearned." The poems combine artistic delicacy of form and finish with tender but solid piety. The poems "To My Soul" and "The Holy Family in Egypt" impressed us with special force. In the former the love-sigh of St. Paul, "Cupio dissolvi," blends with that other of St. M. Magdalen de Pazzi, "Non mori sed pati":

My eager soul, "be still,"
Bide thou His time nor yet so ardent sigh,
Nor beat like prisoned bird the dreary bars,
That shut thee from the sky.

More sweet to creep the earth
If there God's purpose lieth, than to shine
A saint in glory, burning at His feet
Enrapt in love divine.

Swan-like, when comes the hour,
Shall break thy song and rise on heavenward wing—
Love's perfect song that oft thy wistful lips
Have tried, but ne'er could sing.

The other poem just mentioned introduces a very sweet lyric, "Sleep, sleep, sleep," somewhat similar in structure to the old Christmas carol, "Sleep, Holy Babe." "Lost to the world, but gathered to her God," we look with reverence on "the cast mantle she hath left behind her."

H. T. H.

CATHOLIC SUMMER AND WINTER SCHOOL LIBRARY: LECTURES ON LITERATURE. By *Richard Malcolm Johnston*. Akron, O.: D. H. McBride & Co. Pp. 269. Price, 50 cents.

Small books on large subjects are not always great evils. They are not so when made by the masterly and artistic hand—by the mind that takes in a full survey of its theme, and, having at the same time the true instinct of proportion and perspective, is able to select those parts and features and arrange them in such positions and relations as will give the reader a clear and distinct idea of the subject presented. Books of this kind are demanded in this busy age, and when rightly made deserve a welcome. Such is the bright little booklet here at hand—bright in that winsomeness of form which is the marked characteristic of the Summer and Winter School series—a form here most apposite to the matter and spirit of the content.

To tell the story of English, French and Spanish literature within the diminutive bounds of this volume calls for a finished narrator, or else must end in a bald catalogue of bookish names and titles—the skeleton of a sketch, fleshless, bloodless, lifeless. When it is said that the task has been attempted by so accomplished a master of his art as Mr. Johnston—the friends of the venerable litterateur had rather we called him Colonel—it need not be said that the story lives and breathes with a human—a truly humane—instinct. Mr. Johnston has

not, of course, sought to crowd all even of the greatest literary figures and events into his short trilogy. This would certainly have been confounding confusion. In each story he has singled out salient points—special features or marked actors in the events—of the facts, and made his narrative there converge. Thus in English Literature the Drama is the focus, in French Literature the leading figures in the lettered Age of Louis XIV. and the later Encyclopædists are most prominent, whilst in Spanish the Ballad and the Drama are especially emphasized. Around these central points he has gathered many an interesting fact and suggestion, infused with a living sympathy, and clad in that chaste simplicity and easy grace of style which constitute so much of the charm of Colonel Johnston's spoken lectures.

THOUGHTS FOR ALL TIMES. By the *Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan.* With a Preface by the Right Rev. J. C. Hedley, D.D., O.S.B., Bishop of Newport. Roxburghe Press, 15 Victoria Street, Westminster.

We welcome these essays of Monsignor Vaughan as a real addition to Catholic literature. Several of them we recognized as old friends, read years ago in Catholic magazines, and from the preface we learn that most of them have already appeared in print. We are glad to see them thus gathered together in one book. As we were delighted with those we then read, so we are sure that our readers will be. The book, which contains twenty essays, is divided into three parts. In the first part are six: Infinite Love, Thoughts on the Nature of God, Thoughts on the Simplicity of God, Thoughts on the Wisdom of God, The Blessed Trinity Reflected in Man, Vestiges of the Blessed Trinity in Irrational Creatures. In the second part we have Thoughts on the Blessed Eucharist, Transubstantiation and Multiplication, The Shadow of Sin, or the Reasonableness of the Doctrine of Purgatory; "Languishing Love," or the Pains of Purgatory; The Secret Workings of Divine Grace, Union with God. In the third part: The Riddle of Life, Dust to Dust, Ashes to Ashes, Man, a Microcosm; On Pain, Considered as a Motive; Nerves, True and False; Inconsistency, Our Faith and Our Practice; Unity of Faith, The Religion of Protestants, Theology and Vivisection, to which is added a note by Father Gerard, S.J., on the Rights of Animals. Our readers can see from the titles of these essays that they treat of intensely practical questions. Monsignor Vaughan has done well to thus gather them together. They are solid in learning, most apt in illustration, and strong examples of apologetic reasoning. To both clergy and laity they ought to be welcome. The book is beautifully published by the Roxburghe Press. For sale by Benziger Brothers.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANCIENT INDIA. By *Richard Garbe.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1897. Pp. 89. Price, 50 cents.

The author of this booklet is professor in the University of Tübingen. He has here epitomized the history of Indian Philosophy (pp. 1–31), pointed out some connections between Greek and Indian philosophy (pp. 32–56), and discussed the question as to who were the authors of Hindu Monism—priests or warriors (pp. 57–85). The latter problem he solves in favor of the warriors. The solution may be correct; but why does he go out of his way, in a work of this kind, to have a fling at the *priesthood* generally? "Intellectual enlightenment," he says, "is opposed by its natural enemy, the priesthood, until it has

become too strong in the people to be successfully opposed any longer. Then the priest, too, professes the new ideas, and tries to harmonize them as far as possible with his hollow shams" (p. 79). The passage needs no comment. It is itself, however, a suggestive comment on the bent of Prof. Garbe's mind, and throws a side-light on his readiness to turn into "an exceedingly happy idea," something stronger than "a mere supposition," the conjecture—put forth "with great caution," and "without intending in the least to settle the question"—that the Indian conception of the *vâch* (a feminine noun meaning voice, speech, word) "may have had some influence upon the idea of the λόγος, which appears in Neo-Platonism, and *passed from there into the Gospel of St. John*" (p. 53). Apart from this anti-Christian bias of the author, the book is interesting, clear in style, and tasteful in appearance.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGIÆ DE SACRAMENTIS ECCLESIÆ. Auctore *Joan Bapt. Sasse, S.J.* Vol. i. De Sacrt. in genere, Baptismo, Confirm, Euch. Friburgi (Herder: St. Louis, Mo.). 1897. Pp. xv., 590. Price, $2.90.

DE RELIGIONE REVELATA. Libri V. Auctore *Guil. Wilmer, S.J.* Ratisbonæ Pustet. (New York.) 1897. Pp. iv., 686. Price, $2.50.

Reviews of these two substantial additions to the bibliography of theology will appear in our next issue.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE NEW TESTAMENT; translated from the Latin Vulgate, with annotations, references, and an historical and chronological index, with 100 illustrations. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Price, 60 cents.

SHORT LIVES OF THE SAINTS for every day in the year. Including the lives of many Blessed and Venerable Servants of God. By the *Rev. Henry Gibson.* Vol. II. May-August. Received from Benziger Brothers. Price, $1.50.

THE ROMAN MISSAL adapted to the use of the laity, from the Missale Romanum, with English and other appendices, and a collection of prayers. R. Washbourne, Paternoster Row, London. Received from Benziger Brothers.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By the *Rev. J. Duggan,* Catholic priest of Maidstone. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co., Ltd. Received from B. Herder, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. Price, $1.50 net.

SHORT INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND FESTIVALS. From the French, by *Rev. Thomas F. Ward,* Church of St. Charles Borromeo, Brooklyn, N. Y. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LIFE OF CHRIST. By the *Rev. J. Duggan,* Catholic priest of Maidstone. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co., Ltd. New York: Benziger Brothers.

DISUNION AND REUNION. By *W. J. Madden,* sometime Rector R. C. Cathedral, Auckland. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd.

AM I OF THE CHOSEN? A Series of Conferences spoken by the Rev. Henry Aloysius Barry. Boston: Angel Guardian Press.

SUMMER TALKS ABOUT LOURDES. By *Cecilia Mary Caddell.* London: Burns & Oates, Ltd.

A FAMOUS CONVENT SCHOOL. By *Marion J. Brunows.* New York: The Meany Company.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By *Rev. William Stang, D.D.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

A GLIMPSE OF ORGANIC LIFE. By *William Seton, LL.D.* New York: P. O'Shea.

PERIODICAL

70754

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM